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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research project was to examine the relationship between unmet job expectations and burnout among selected Ontario Children's Aid Society direct service workers in Southwestern Ontario. Two related issues to be examined were to determine what factors were most highly related to burnout and to develop a profile of a burned out social worker.

This study commenced with a computer search of the available literature on burnout, especially within the helping professions. The review of the literature included an overview of the problem of burnout, a definition of the term, a discussion of the scope of the problem (both in terms of behavioural manifestations and consequences) and a discussion of the concept of cognitive dissonance as it relates to burnout. Research questions were devised to address the identified purposes of the study.

The population for this research included 128 direct service social workers at six selected Children's Aid Societies in Southwestern Ontario. The actual sample consisted of 107 of these workers after questionnaires with five or more missing items were eliminated.

The questionnaire was developed to measure demographic variables; the expectations of workers as they commenced
employment at CAS; their perceptions of actual conditions and the degree of burnout that they experienced. Expectations and perceptions were measured in 27 different areas identified in the literature review. The questionnaires were completed by respondents at staff meetings in the presence of the researchers.

The research findings indicate that there are eight major components of burnout, that certain unmet job expectations are related to burnout; that current perceptions are most highly correlated with burnout, followed by differences between original expectations and current perceptions, then by original expectations.

It was concluded that the most pervasive forms of burnout within the population are tedium, ambivalence toward clients and callousness toward clients. The factors most highly correlated with burnout were generally in the areas of personal, professional and organizational support and generally involved factors external to the workers. Although demographic variables were not pervasive in the profile of a burned out worker, it was evident that respondents in the high burnout group enjoyed less professional satisfaction than originally expected, perceived themselves as being unable to separate work and home life and perceived themselves as unprepared for intense emotional involvement on the job.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers would like to thank the members of the research committee for their invaluable support and advice throughout this project: Professor Harry Morrow, School of Social Work, University of Windsor, for helping us to maintain perspective; Professor Rosemary Cassano, School of Social Work, University of Windsor, for helping us to maintain focus and clarity and Dr. William Libby, Department of Psychology, University of Windsor, for helping us to find meaning in statistics and numbers.

A project of this scope would not have been possible without the kind permission of agency directors and boards and without cooperation of the respondents who took time from their already busy schedules and who participated so willingly and honestly.

Our sincerest thanks are expressed to Debbie Spicer-Biddle for her help in the compiling of data.

We would also like to thank Ann Merner for her willingness and care in typing this transcript on short notice.

We would especially like to thank Dianne Boniferro and Shirley McLachlan for their forbearance and support in the face of many frustrations during this prolonged process.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF APPENDICES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Introduction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Overview</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Definition of Burnout</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Scope of the Problem</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1 Behavioral Manifestations of Burnout</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2 Consequences of Burnout</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2.1 Turnover</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2.2 Withdrawal While Staying</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2.3 Mental and Physical Health</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3 Summary of the Scope of the Problem</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Burnout and Cognitive Dissonance</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1 Theory of Cognitive Dissonance</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2 Cognitive Dissonance as it Relates to</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3 Expectations</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3.1 Social Worker's Expectations of Self</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3.2 Social Worker's Expectations of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3.3 Social Worker's Expectations of the Agency</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3.4 Social Worker's Expectations of the Community</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3.5 Social Worker's Expectations of the Profession</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3.6 Summary of Expectations</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Selection of a Specific Population and Sample .................................. 43
3.2 Classification of the Research ................................. 47
3.3 Study Design ................................... 48
3.4 Research Questions .................................. 49
3.5 The Population .................................. 50
3.5.1 The Sample .................................. 51
3.6 The Pretest .................................. 54
3.7 The Data Gathering Instrument ......................... 57
3.7.1 Demographic Data .................................. 61
3.7.2 Expectations and Perceptions .................................. 62
3.7.3 The Maslach Burnout Inventory ......................... 65
3.8 Statistical Analysis of Data .................................. 66
3.8.1 Factor Analysis .................................. 66
3.8.2 Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis .......... 67
3.8.3 Discriminant Analysis .................................. 67

### IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS ........... 69

4.1 Analysis of Instruments .................................. 70
4.1.1 Maslach's Subscales Applied to this Data ................. 70
4.1.2 Principal Components Analyses ......................... 71
4.1.2.1 Maslach Burnout Inventory .......................... 72
4.1.2.2 M.B.I. Frequencies Items .......................... 72
4.1.2.3 M.B.I. Intensities Items .......................... 75
4.1.2.4 Correlations of M.B.I. Factors .......................... 78
4.1.2.5 Second Order Principal Components Analysis of M.B.I. Frequencies and M.B.I. Intensities Factors .... 80
4.1.2.6 Expectations Items .................................. 82
4.1.2.7 Perceptions Items .................................. 88
4.1.2.8 Difference Scores Described .......................... 93
4.1.2.9 Principal Components Analysis of Difference Scores .......... 93
4.2 Major Results .................................. 98
4.2.1 Comparisons of Means for Expectations Perceptions and Difference Items .... 98
4.2.2 Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) Analyses .......... 101
4.2.2.2 Second Order M.B.I. Factors Correlated with Expectations, Perceptions and Differences Factors .... 101
4.2.2.3 Second Order M.B.I. Factors Correlated with Perceptions Factors .......... 103
CHAPTER

4.2.2.4 Second Order M.B.I. Factors Correlated with Differences Factors .................................. 108
4.2.2.5 Second Order M.B.I. Factors Correlated with Expectations Factors .................................. 111
4.2.3 Stepwise Discriminant Function Analysis ................................................................. 114
4.2.4 Summary ....................................................................................................................... 118

V. DISCUSSION OF DATA AND FINDINGS ........................................................................... 123

5.1 The Components of Burnout ...................................................................................... 123
5.2 The Components of Expectations, Perceptions and Differences ...................................... 126
5.3 Are Unmet Job Expectations Related to Burnout? ....................................................... 130
5.4 Factors Most Highly Related to Burnout ................................................................. 136
5.4.1 Perceptions Factors .................................................................................................. 137
5.4.2 Differences Factors .................................................................................................. 144
5.4.3 Expectations Factors .............................................................................................. 144
5.5 The Profile of a Burned Out Social Worker ................................................................ 147

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ................................................................ 150

6.1 Major Research Findings .......................................................................................... 151
6.1.1 Components of Burnout ......................................................................................... 151
6.1.2 Expectations Factors .............................................................................................. 151
6.1.3 Perceptions Factors ............................................................................................... 152
6.1.4 Differences Factors ............................................................................................... 152
6.1.5 Are Unmet Job Expectations Related to Burnout? ................................................. 153
6.1.6 What Factors are Most Significantly Related to Burnout? .................................... 153
6.1.7 What is the Profile of a Burned Out Worker? ....................................................... 154

6.2 Recommendations ........................................................................................................ 155
6.2.1 Symptoms for Which to be Alert ......................................................................... 155
6.2.2 Organizational Factors ......................................................................................... 156
6.2.2.1 Recognition ....................................................................................................... 157
6.2.2.2 Use of Time ....................................................................................................... 158
6.2.2.3 Participation in the Organization ...................................................................... 158
6.2.3 Personal Factors ..................................................................................................... 159
6.2.4 Professional Factors ............................................................................................... 160
6.2.5 Recommendations for Future Research ............................................................... 161

APPENDICES ...................................................................................................................... 163

BIBLIOGRAPHY .................................................................................................................. 193

VITAE AUCTORI .................................................................................................................. 201
### LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.3</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.6</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.7</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2.9</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2.2</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Demographic Profile of Sample**
- **Conceptual Variables Measured in Each Question**
- **Maslach's Four Subscales Intercorrelated Using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients**
- **Principal Components Analysis of Frequencies Scores (M.B.I.): Loadings of M.B.I. Frequencies Items on Factors**
- **Principal Components Analysis of Intensities Scores (M.B.I.): Loadings of M.B.I. Intensities Items on Factors**
- **Second Order Principal Components Analysis of Frequencies M.B.I. and Intensities M.B.I. Factors: Loadings of First Order M.B.I. Frequencies and Intensities M.B.I. Factors on Second Order Factors**
- **Principal Components Analysis of Expectations Scores: Loadings of Expectations Items on Factors**
- **Principal Components Analysis of Perceptions Scores: Loadings of Perceptions Items on Factors**
- **Principal Components Analysis of Difference Scores: Loadings of Difference Scores on Items**
- **Comparison of Group Mean Responses for Each Variable within the Expectations, Perceptions and Differences Scales**
- **Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients (r) for Correlations between Second Order M.B.I. Factors and Expectations, Perceptions and Differences Factors**
- **Factor or Item Means for High Burnout vs. Low Burnout Groups; together with Stepwise Discriminant Function Analysis Identifying Items or Factors Which Best Discriminate between High Burnout and Low Burnout Groups**
# LIST OF APPENDICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Letter Requesting Permission to Pretest the Instrument</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Research Instrument and Covering Letter</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients (r) for intercorrelations of Maslach's Subscales; Frequencies M.B.I., Intensities M.B.I. and Combined Frequencies/Intensities M.B.I. Factors</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Principal Components Analysis of M.B.I. Frequencies and Intensities Items Combined: Loadings of M.B.I. Frequencies and Intensities Items on Factors</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A STUDY OF BURNOUT
AMONG DIRECT SERVICE SOCIAL WORKERS IN
SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETIES
AS IT RELATES TO UNMET JOB EXPECTATIONS

by

Glenda M. Fisher
and
James T. D. Boniferro

A Thesis
submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the School of Social Work
in Partial Fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Social Work at
The University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada
1981
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The problem of burnout is currently receiving an increasing amount of attention especially among members of the helping professions. However, the conceptualizations and attendant discussions of this phenomenon remain largely impressionistic and subjective. The researchers perceive the current discussions as lacking clarity with respect to exactly what the phenomenon of burnout is, what causes it and what its effects are. There seems to exist the notion that whatever burnout is, it may be too subjective a concept or experience to expose to the rigors of scientific research. Some have hastily dismissed the concept in light of assertions that the problem is subjective or "inside people's heads" and therefore cannot be real or is not important for the common good.

The researchers became interested in this problem as a result of their work experiences within three Ontario Children's Aid Societies. They observed that they and their colleagues manifested burnout in a variety of ways, attributing it to a multiplicity of causes both subjective and organizational. The importance of pursuing this project lies within the unanswered question as to whether the causes of burnout

1.
lie within the individual, within his environment or within both factors./

Social work practitioners frequently face conflicting demands and expectations from a number of sources including: the organization within which they are employed; the client population; the immediate community and society as a whole through legal mandates, not to mention the expectations of supervisors, colleagues and themselves. When the worker is unable to cope with these demands and their accompanying stresses on a continuous basis, burnout is likely to result.

The researchers speculated that a dissonance results from discrepancies between the expectations of the worker as an individual and the actuality of experiences on the job. This is consistent with Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance as that which the worker is obliged to do is often incongruent with his values, beliefs, goals and aspirations. We suspected that the amount of physical and psychological energy expended in attempting to resolve this dilemma may result in a state of burnout.

If attempts are to be made to deal with the negative organizational and personal influences related to burnout, as well as the consequences of burnout, then it is imperative that a focus of intervention be determined. This research project is an attempt to provide significant information which will lead to a beginning identification of a focus of intervention for burnout.

This study approaches the problem of burnout from a very
broad perspective and reduces the essential elements of burnout and their most significant correlates to the simplest of terms. By applying scientific methodology and statistical techniques, the researchers intended to investigate the validity of the impressions of authors as evidenced within the literature by determining whether or not statistically significant correlations exist between burnout and these impressions.

Accordingly, a thorough literature review of available material in the areas of burnout and cognitive dissonance was conducted. The researchers reviewed the literature on burnout from the perspectives of the definition, scope, manifestations and consequences of the problem. A decision was made in the very early stages of the study to exclude related concepts such as turnover, job dissatisfaction and morale because they did not serve to clarify the discussion.

A questionnaire was then developed in order to measure original expectations of individual workers upon commencement of employment, their current perceptions (and the differences between the two) in addition to selected demographic variables and the respondent's level of burnout. This questionnaire consisted of items related to 27 variables selected from the literature on burnout.

In summary, this study examines whether or not unmet job expectations are related to burnout. Secondly, it determines the profile of a burnout worker. Thirdly, it determines those factors which are most significantly related to burnout.

The results of this research will be used for the purpose
of developing recommendations to both front-line and administrative staff in Children's Aid Societies and other agencies regarding the most appropriate and effective means of resolving burnout.

The researchers plan to present the findings of this study to professional community groups by means of seminars and workshops and hopefully through published articles in social science journals.
CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This chapter represents a comprehensive review of the literature that has been written on the subject of burnout, particularly those articles relating specifically to the helping professions. This review included a computer search of the Social Science Citation Index (dating back to 1970 and updated quarterly) and the Psychological Abstracts (dated from 1967 to October, 1979), through the Lougheed Missiles and Space Corporation, Palo Alto, California. The former index listed thirty-two citations while the latter listed six. The citations in each of these articles and books were then checked for relevance to the topic. Generally, the literature review was limited by the fact that some articles were unpublished or very recently published and therefore inaccessible to the researchers.

The review also included exhaustive use of the facilities and publications available at the Leddy Library at the University of Windsor, as well as the interlibrary loan service.

Burnout was the sole topic researched because it was found that areas such as job dissatisfaction, morale, and turnover were only peripherally related to the topic and therefore of limited value. The theory of cognitive disson-
ance is an integral part of the work but there was no need to investigate beyond the original work of Leon Festinger. Expectations is another integral part of this study but most of the discussion on expectations is drawn from the available literature on burnout, rather than on works relating specifically to expectations theory.

Thus, the literature review chapter includes a presentation of the literature relating to the following areas:
1) definition of the term and problem of burnout,
2) scope of the problem,
3) behavioral manifestations of burnout,
4) consequences of burnout,
5) the theory of cognitive dissonance, especially as it relates to burnout.

2.2 Overview

You come in with all these ideals on how you're going to help kids in trouble. Then the agency hits you with all this red tape and paper work. The kids and their parents don't want your help and tell you to go to hell. The public is apathetic and the press is breathing down your back if you make one mistake. Pretty soon you lose those ideals. So you either learn to put up with it or you quit. I'm looking around. I've got to get out--a Children's Aid Society social worker. (Maralek, 1979)

The stress of continuous contact with needy people in a helping capacity has recently become a major source of concern among helping professionals. The media and professional journals have responded to this concern by publishing an increasing number of articles about stress in the workplace. The helping professions have received special consideration because of their high public profile and because of the unique pressures that confront mental health professionals. (Reid, 1979)
The phenomenon of burnout is the stress-related concept that has received the most attention. Whereas, this increased attention has served to enhance professional and public awareness of the incidence and personal and organizational consequences of burnout, it has also served to confuse the issue. Burnout has become a catch-all term that is used to describe all that is negative and wrong in the workplace. Mattingly (1979a) supports this view by stating that "burnout is a term that is intuitively grasped and accepted and at the same time a phenomenon about which there is little precise understanding."

This is the result of a lack of agreement among the major authors as to what exactly burnout is and even less agreement as to which of a multitude of personal and organizational factors are most directly related to burnout. The professional literature is characterized by a failure to subject this field of study to the rigors of scientific research.

It is only within the past few years that research into the area of burnout and related concepts such as job dissatisfaction, morale, motivation, coping, stress, turnover, etc. has expanded from the study of industry and business to include the field of the mental health professions. In attempting to generalize the findings of studies conducted in industry, researchers must be cautious because in human services the primary tool of the helper is himself and the primary products of his efforts are intangible relationships, feelings and behaviours. This is not the case in business and industry where tools and products tend to be more concrete.
and more clearly defined.

2.3 Definition of Burnout

The problems inherent in attempting to define the concept of burnout have already been mentioned although there is general agreement that burnout is an exhaustion syndrome. However, while some authors suggest that burnout is equivalent to job dissatisfaction and an inability to cope with job stress, other authors see burnout as a dependent variable, created by or resulting from job dissatisfaction or job stress. The dilemma is most effectively described by Pines, Kafry and Etzion (1979) when they write that:

it is not clear whether it is burnout that causes you to drink too much, take too much Valium or smoke too much, or whether it is drinking, smoking and taking pills that make you burnout; what is clear is that there is a relationship between them.

It is possible to avoid the problem of defining burnout in specific terms and delineating dependent and independent variables. For example, Shinn (1979) defines burnout as "the entire constellation of psychological strain, poor job performance and maladaptive coping responses." The inadequacy of this definition is evident in that the components are much too broad and vague to facilitate scientific enquiry. Since there is no attempt to specify key variables and the relationships among them, it is impossible to identify the most significant components of the problem.

Sourkes (1979) quotes Charles Larson's definition of burnout as "the condition of decreased productivity, diminished job satisfaction and increased likelihood of withdrawal as a
result of prolonged or acute job stress." He further suggests that burnout is "to fail, to wear out or become exhausted with the job and environment as a result of excessive demands on personal energy, strength or resources." Again, in an apparent attempt to make the definition all-inclusive it becomes so broad as to be meaningless.

Mattingly (1977b) reflects the unsophisticated state of research into the problem in her assertion that "Burnout, as it is currently understood, is a subtle pattern of symptoms, behaviours and attitudes that are unique for each person." Daley (1979a) similarly defines burnout as "a reaction to job related stress that varies in nature with the intensity and duration of the stress itself." These are valid observations insofar as they emphasize the individual nature of the responses to and consequences of burnout, but they do not aid in the search for the common thread that links these individuals. If this common thread does not exist, then the very term burnout becomes meaningless.

Another approach is to define burnout in terms of its consequences or effects. Kahn (1978) suggests that burnout is a syndrome of inappropriate attitudes toward self, often associated with uncomfortable physical and emotional symptoms ranging from insomnia to migraine and ulcer. It seems inappropriate to define a syndrome without alluding to the causes or predetermining factors as well as the consequences.

Attempts to describe burnout in terms of some of the related concepts previously mentioned have met with limited
success. For example, Cotton and Browne (1978) attempt to describe burnout in organization development professionals as the physical, psychological and spiritual fatigue that results from hygiene and motivation factors as described by Herzberg (1959) in his two factor theory of job satisfaction. However, Maslach (1978a), one of the leading researchers in the area of burnout in the helping professions, insists that burnout is not the same as boredom, dissatisfaction or stress on the job. Resener (1979) describes burnout as a syndrome in which chronic emotional stress on the job so completely exhausts certain individuals physically and mentally that they cease to care about their work. She goes on to emphasize that the concept of burnout is separate from that of job dissatisfaction or simple feelings of overwork because burnout may exist in spite of high salary, opportunities for advancement and good relationships with supervisors and caseworkers, variables that have traditionally been related to job dissatisfaction.

Having described the problems encountered in defining and describing burnout, a comprehensive summary of the various definitions preferred will be presented in an attempt to demonstrate that emotional exhaustion is the key concept.

Pines, Kafry and Etzion (1979) view burnout as "manifested in a cluster of physical, emotional and mental exhaustion reactions. It is the result of constant and repeated emotional pressure associated with intense involvement with people over long periods of time." This definition also recognizes the
individuality of responses but clearly identifies exhaustion and intense interaction with people as the key components. This definition is obviously tailored to describing burnout in the helping professions specifically. It is also very similar to definitions preferred by Maslach in other articles. For example, Pines and Maslach (1980) collaborated on a piece of research in which they defined burnout as "a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that can occur among individuals who spend much of their time working closely with people." Maslach (1978a) refers to burnout as "the emotional exhaustion resulting from the stress of interpersonal contact."

Sullivan (1979) similarly defines the syndrome as the exhaustion of a person's psychological and/or physical resources, usually after long and intense caring. In human terms it means worn out, given up, spent, dissipated, enervated, depleted, drained, consumed, used up, even prostrated.

Perhaps it is unfair to criticize these definitions while quoting them in isolation, but weaknesses in this approach to examining burnout have been clearly identified. The primary weakness is in the assertion that burnout results from prolonged intense contact with people. While this is probably true, it does not adequately explain or describe the dynamics which occur during this intense contact that predispose some individuals and not others to burn out. It does not identify how certain individuals are better able to cope or why that which motivates one individual may overwhelm another. Intense interpersonal contact in and of itself does not seem to be an adequate explanation of the resulting exhaustion.
The subtle implication in the above definitions is that the roots of burnout lie outside the individual. In fact, Maslach (1978a & b) has "concluded that burnout is best understood (and modified) in terms of the social and situational sources of job related stress." This view of burnout as environmentally based is supported by Larson, Gilbertson and Powell (1978) when they describe burnout as

the therapists' failure to muster the reserves necessary to remain effective on the job. It is furthermore, the byproduct of working within an environment which places constant demands on its professionals, without allowing for a balancing of experiences within that environment which may contribute to the therapists' differentiation, identification and growth.

In describing youth counsellor burnout, Van Auken (1979) also ascribes to the perspective of environmental impingement. "Burnout is that state of mind and body induced in normal adults by overexposure to the complicated, confused lives of unruly, runaway, truant, or delinquent children and their families."

The researchers support the view that burnout is closely related to one's relationship with his or her environment. However, environmental variables are more likely to be mediating factors. This conclusion is drawn from the fact that each individual interacts with, acts and responds to his environment in unique ways.

Freudenberger (1977b) suggests that in finding fault with everything and everyone around them, complaining about the organization and reacting cynically to whatever is suggested or attempted by others, people in the throes of burning out
"often fail to see their situation as stemming from inside themselves." His definition of burnout (1974, 1977a), "to fail, wear out or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength or resources" implies that the demands originate or are mediated within the individual.

The objective environment elicits differing reactions from each of us. Thus, rather than asserting that the environment elicits certain responses from the individual, thereby creating burnout, the researchers hypothesize that the key lies in how the individual perceives his environment, regardless of objective reality. Burnout results when there is a discrepancy between the individual's perception of the way things are and his or her perception of the way things ought to be. Thus, the researchers view burnout as a subjective experience related to subjective rather than objective reality. Hagamen (1979) collaborates this view when she describes burnout syndrome as "the exhaustion of a person's psychological and/or physical resources after long, intense caring and striving for a goal that now appears unattainable."

There is an element of disappointment or unmet expectations encompassed by this definition.

The Berkeley Planning Associates (1977) prepared an evaluation of Child Abuse and Neglect Demonstration Projects in which they defined burnout as "the extent to which a worker has become separated or withdrawn from the original meaning or purpose of his work...the degree to which a worker expresses estrangement from clients, co-workers and the
agency." The strength of this definition lies in the fact that the concepts are measurable. Estrangement is, by definition, a subjective perception.

The following model will explain the relationship among expectations, perceptions and burnout, while at the same time developing a definition of burnout based on these concepts.

2.4 Scope of the Problem

Having defined burnout and demonstrated its relatedness to worker's perceptions and expectations, it is important to clarify the scope of the problem. This will be accomplished in three ways, First, the symptoms of burnout or the characteristic behaviours associated with the syndrome will be described. Second, the consequences of these symptoms for the client, the organization and the worker will be outlined. Third, statistics and studies to indicate the extent and severity of the problem will be cited throughout the discussion that follows.

2.4.1 Behavioural Manifestations of Burnout

Generally,

burnout involves the loss of concern for the people with whom one is working. In addition to physical exhaustion (and sometimes even illness), burnout is characterized by an emotional exhaustion in which the professional no longer has any positive feelings, sympathy or respect for clients. (Maslach and Pines, 1977; Maslach, 1978b)

Resener (1979) broadens the scope of symptoms even further by stating that burnout is "marked by extreme disillusionment and ultimate withdrawal from family and career."

Early symptoms are likely to include general fatigue, a tightness in the back and shoulders, sleeping difficulties
and a dependence on alcohol or drugs. Later symptoms include doing one's job mechanically or carelessly, an unaccountably hostile attitude toward people at work and withdrawal from important relationships in one's life.

The Berkeley Planning Associates (1977) present a comprehensive list of the typical symptoms of burnout. These symptoms are indicative of the individual attempting to dissociate himself from the client and organization (or "negate his self and environment" as Pines and Kafry (1978) aptly describe the process) because he no longer possesses the energy to deal with the problems he encounters in both spheres. They include:

1. a high resistance to going to work every day (dragging one's feet);
2. somatic symptoms, the nagging cold, frequent bouts with a virus or flu;
3. feeling tired and exhausted all day, frequent clock watching to see how late it is, usually accompanied by tiredness after work;
4. postponing client contacts, resisting client phone calls and office visits;
5. stereotyping clients ("here goes the same old story");
6. an inability to concentrate or listen to what the client is saying;
7. feeling intolerant of clients' anger, an inability to understand and interpret client anger;
8. driving the long way to a client's home, driving around the block before entering the client's home;
9. feeling immobilized ("there is nothing I can do to help these people");
10. excessive anxiety about investigating a new client referral or making a home visit;
11. walking through department stores frequently in the afternoon between home visits;
12. problems sleeping at night, tossing and turning, feeling restless;
13. cynicism regarding clients, an emerging blaming attitude ("these clients create their own problems");
14. increasingly relying on rules to deal with client demands.
This symptomatology is confirmed in numerous other works. For example, Sourkes (1979) describes the symptoms of burnout as including

increased use of sick days, tardiness and absenteeism, fatigue and frequent use of extensions, drop in productivity, isolation from one's work group, 'bitching', anger toward and dehumanizing of consumers, resistance to change, apathy, isolation, forgetfulness and depression.

Reid (1979) suggests that

The most striking finding was a tremendous sense of powerlessness felt by workers. Some felt so overwhelmed that they no longer returned phone calls and dreaded going to work. Others spoke of psychosomatic complaints such as nausea, headaches, and back pain experienced while they were at work.

Maslach (1978a) describes the symptoms of burnout in terms of the strategies the individual adopts in an attempt to deal with the syndrome. For example, the burned out worker may intellectualize so as to reduce emotional involvement. Derogatory labelling of clients and their problems as well as blaming clients for their own victimization are two modes of intellectualization identified by Maslach and Pines (1977) and Maslach (1976, 1978a&b). Koriat et. al. (1972) found that the more the worker was initially threatened by the client, the more likely he was to blame the client for his own misfortune. The worker may also facilitate psychological withdrawal from the client through physical distancing such as standing or sitting farther away than he normally would or, making less eye contact (Maslach 1976). The worker may also "invent quick emotional breathers such as leaving the room on the pretext of getting the client's files." Maslach also cites the phenomenon of the petty bureaucrat, who applies policies and procedures
strictly and inflexibly. She states (and this is supported by Mattingly, 1977b) that as burnout becomes more severe, the separation between one's work and one's private life begins to fall apart so that overtime and amount of time spent working at home increase. Daley (1979a) identifies the same symptoms but argues that, at the other extreme, the burned out worker may separate home and work so exclusively that he refuses to discuss work at home or vice versa. At any rate, home life deteriorates as arguments and threats of divorce become more common (Resener, 1979; Freudenberg, 1977a and Maslach 1978b). It is natural to want to get away from people for awhile having spent the entire day in intense emotional encounters. However, this desire to get away from it all can only inhibit family and marital relationships. Thus, the burned out worker may become alienated from his primary source of support.

Van Auken (1979) lists glassy eyes, listlessness, anxiety, psychosomatic illnesses and unusual speech patterns as symptoms of burnout among youth counsellors.

Freudenberg (1974, 1977a&b) finds that burned out workers encounter great difficulty in holding in feelings. For example they are quick to anger and become irritated; they cry or scream too easily. Suspicious and paranoid attitudes become apparent as the worker suspects that clients, colleagues and management are "out to screw him." Feelings of omnipotence may result from the worker's perception that he has experienced it all before so that he begins to take unnecessary and unreasonable risks in his interactions with clients. Mattingly (1977b)
states that he may lose trust in his colleagues and insist that he must do everything himself, thereby further isolating himself. At the other extreme, the worker becomes excessively rigid, cynical, stubborn and inflexible. He may begin to underevaluate his competence or expertise, thereby inhibiting competent, confident performance. A final symptom cited by Freudengerber (1974) is a tendency to spend more and more time at work, and a tendency to expend more and more energy while accomplishing less and less.

Specific physical symptoms of stress have been correlated with burnout. Freudengerber (1974) lists feelings of exhaustion and fatigue, being unable to shake a lingering cold, suffering from frequent headaches and gastro-intestinal disturbances, sleeplessness and shortness of breath." Malarek (1979) and Maslach (1978b) also describe these symptoms. Physical symptoms also include elevated heart rates, elevated blood pressure and increases of adrenalin and noradrenalin (Kahn, 1978) all of which are considered high risk factors for coronary disease. Kahn further describes peptic ulcers as resulting from direct "hands-on" responsibility for the well-being of others, a condition that likely leads to burnout, as will be discussed later.

It is clear that burnout results in a wide range of physical and psychological symptoms. Freudengerber (1977a) expresses it best when he states that

The symptoms of burnout manifest themselves in every area of the worker's life: his functioning with clients; his relationship to the agency; his life outside the agency, including his emotional attitude and bodily complaints.
The idiosyncratic nature of the symptomatology of burnout has no doubt contributed to the confusion in defining and delin-
eating the term. However, it is to be expected that stress will influence individuals differently by gnawing away at pre-
disposed weaknesses. The diverse symptomatology should not be misconstrued to mean that there cannot be an underlying cause for burnout (such as expectations as previously argued).

2.4.2 Consequences of Burnout

It is clear that the symptoms described above will have severe consequences for the workers' personal and professional lives, for the organization and for the clients they intend to serve. These consequences are as diverse as the symptoms discussed above but they can be classified within three general categories: turnover (or withdrawing completely from the system); withdrawal while staying which may be manifested by cynical attitudes and absenteeism (Fettman 1975); and physical and mental illness.

The Berkeley Planning Associates (1977) describe the devastating effects of a worker's attempts to dissociate himself from his clients. Not only does the client not receive the required help, but he may actually feel more inept or inadequate because he sees himself as merely creating more problems for the worker. As the worker loses his commitment he may "become sick, leave the job or translate this sense of failure into cynicism, apathy and alienation." This is only one study of many that correlates burnout with absenteeism and turnover. (See also Daley, 1979a&b; Freudenberger, 1977a;
Malarek, 1979; The London Free Press, 1979; Maslach 1978a&b; Maslach 1976; Pines and Maslach, 1980.) Perhaps even worse from the perspective of both client and worker is the phenomenon of the individual who experiences "deadness" and ill health, but remains in a position he finds meaningless because of security needs or a limited job market. In fact, Reid (1979) reports that in one study "nearly a quarter of the sample (of social workers with masters degrees) had seriously considered leaving the profession within the previous twelve months. . . but had decided to stay. Another nine percent of the sample had definitely decided to leave and were making plans for another line of work." Shinn (1979) suggests that those who remain may be unable to invest sufficient energy to establish warm, trusting and stable relationships that are so critical in the human services. They may also feel so guilty about this that they will spend additional hours and energy to compensate, thereby accelerating the burnout cycle.

2.4.2.1 Turnover. Corniss et. al. (1979) report serious consequences resulting from the "semitransient condition" in group homes, a term used to describe the fact that few employees stay more than one year. The difficulties extend to every facet of group home programs, since short term employee tenures can create continual readjusting problems for employees, employers, youths and the community, difficulties in effectively treating the youths, and serious follow-up problems upon youths' release from the program.

Mattingly (1977a) also refers to consequences for the field of child care, that can easily be generalized to all helping professions, particularly protective services:
Child care has made enormous strides toward professionalization in the last several years, but if it is to survive, the child care worker can no longer be considered expendable. A substantial cadre of mature workers must develop: persons who combine knowledge based practice with the refined clinical skills that come only from experience. The movement toward professionalization has focused an urgent concern with the level of stress experienced by workers in clinical child care, that is, direct, frontline care giving. Many trained and dedicated workers are either lost to the field or have their effectiveness greatly diminished because of the impact of physical and psychological exhaustion that arises from the essential structure of child care work. It has been noted that many very good practitioners, who are sensitive to the stress, and honest in evaluating their ability to be effective with children are "burning out".

This issue of labour turnover has been subjected to some research. The researchers do not intend to suggest that burnout is the sole, or even the primary determinant of turnover in the helping professions. It is inevitable that some turnover will exist in any setting as a natural result of promotions or a need to expand one's horizons. In fact, low turnover is considered dangerous for an organization (Gaudet, 1960; Kermish & Kushin, 1969) because it may indicate that the agency has become a "haven for incompetents". A reasonable rate of turnover ensures that new blood and fresh ideas are infused into the organization, thereby mitigating against organizational stagnation.

However, as previously indicated, there is ample evidence that turnover in the helping professions is clearly disproportionate. In arguing that "staff burnout and job turnover are critical problems for the human service professions" because they are "debilitating to workers, detrimental to clients and costly to agencies," Shinn (1979) states that
professionals in social work and rehabilitation services leave their jobs at about twice the rate (25% to 30% per year) of professionals in non-service fields and that "rates in residential treatment program for youth may run as high as 200% per year." There is also evidence that where termination is voluntary, large proportions of those leaving do not give the actual reason because of concerns about future employability and receiving a good reference (Kermish and Kushin, 1969).

Excessive turnover creates a variety of costs and problems for any agency or organization. For example, Samuel (1969) lists the following costs that are particularly relevant to helping agencies:

1. Recruitment and induction costs
   - advertising, interviewing, paperwork
   - non productive time during induction

2. Wages cost of training and learning
   - sub-standard output during the learning period
   - earnings of training personnel (supervisors, co-workers, etc.)

3. Cost of regaining lost time (resulting from both ineffective working of a new recruit and often of the outgoing employee prior to termination)
   - cost of additional overtime required of other employees
   - cost of redeploying employees

4. The intangible costs to consumers.

Price (1977) argues that excessive turnover inhibits organizational integration so that there is less participation in primary relationships. This results in decreased levels of mutual support. Podell (1969) further suggests that "high turnover can add substantially to a department's administrative,
supervisory, training and caseload coverage problems.\textsuperscript{1} Regardless of how well formulated a plan is, it cannot be executed with inexperienced staff. Thus, turnover has serious consequences for agencies and clients.

2.4.2.2 Withdrawal while staying. Burned out workers who withdraw while staying experience detachment in the worker-client relationship that dehumanizes the client and decreases worker effectiveness (Maslach 1976, 1978a\&b). Withdrawal is a form of flight reaction to stress that has been identified by Emener (1979) as working to the detriment of workers, co-workers and clients. He maintains that this is a dysfunctional response predicated upon a "lack of genuine appreciation for the problem" and a lack of an "authentic commitment toward realistic resolution" by the victim.

This experience of detachment may have far reaching impact upon the affected worker. Koriat et. al. (1972) speculate that once attempted successfully, detachment may inhibit subsequent involvement; contrariwise, involvement at the outset may not have such restricting effects on detachment. (Thus) detachment as a generalized style of coping (makes) it difficult for a person ever to enjoy a labile or reactive emotional life. If whenever one is exposed to an emotional experience he starts to respond to it by detachment, he may be thereby incapable of relinquishing this orientation on other similar experiences.

Lamb (1979) also identifies boredom, frustration, resentment and withdrawal from patients as consequences of burnout in chronic health care settings.

As a result of exposure to burned out workers, clients have complained about
being pushed around, ignored, mistreated, and/or deceived. They often feel ignorant about what is going on, frustrated and angry at not getting what they want, and powerless to effect any positive change in this situation. (Maslach, 1978b)

Maslach further discusses the perspective of the client:

In many cases the clients see the cause of their problems as the individual people who staff the institutions, since their experience with institutions actually translates into their experience dealing with particular staff people. Clients often accuse staff of being cold, unfeeling, incompetent and even cruel. At times they are more likely to view staff as adversaries than as aides, and feel that staff are only putting more stumbling blocks in their path. Or they may accuse staff of selling out to an oppressive system by becoming a part of it. Whatever form these complaints take, they all serve to identify the professional staff as a source of the client’s difficulties in dealing with the service bureaucracy.

If these complaints have any legitimacy at all, they are reflective of the frustrations experienced by clients in their attempt to deal with detached individuals. Deterioration in the quality of service rendered to the client population is characteristic of this detachment. Further, these clients are complaining that they are being dehumanized by social workers, a process described by Maslach and Pines (1977) as "one that produces a decreased awareness of the human attributes of others and a loss of humanity in interpersonal interactions." This implies a loss of empathy whereby workers "stop perceiving others as having the same feelings, impulses, thoughts and purposes in life as they have, and thus psychologically eliminate any human qualities that these others might share with them." This concept of dehumanization is supported by Resener (1979), Pines and Solomon (1977) and Sourkes (1979).
2.4.2.3 Mental and physical health. Burnout also may have serious consequences for an individual's physical health as alluded to in our discussion of the physical symptoms of burnout. Cobb (1975) reports that ulcers, heart attacks, hypertension and diabetes are "unduly common among persons subject to close, personal responsibility for the lives of other people."

Higher rates of accident, suicide, alcoholism and drug abuse have all been correlated with burnout (Maslach, 1976, 1978a; Mattingly, 1977b; Pines and Maslach, 1980). The implications for the mental health of workers are also clear. Colligan et. al. (1977) report that social workers rank twenty fourth among 130 occupational groups in mental health admission rates, at a rate of 10.85 admissions per thousand. The findings of this study further indicate that social workers have a higher incidence of mental health problems than would be expected from population norms. This data must be interpreted cautiously because of potential confounding variables, such as the fact that the majority of social workers are women and women generally have higher admission rates, a phenomenon described by Colligan as a sex biasing factor. However, when considered in the context of all evidence presented here, mental health problems become evident. It is also interesting to note that the National Institute for Occupational Health and Safety (1978) reports that out of a total of one hundred thirty occupations, social work was one of forty which exhibited a higher than expected incidence of stress related disorders. This was
determined from data collected from death certificates, mental hospitals and general hospitals.

2.4.3 Summary of the Scope of the Problem

The researchers have defined burnout; demonstrated that it is a serious problem in the helping professions and that it is correlated with certain negative phenomena such as excessive turnover, absenteeism, physical illness and poor service to the consumer. The symptoms and consequences of burnout have also been outlined. Mitchell (1977) describes one result that has not yet been addressed:

One result that burnout does not produce, unfortunately, is immunization from burnout in the future. It can occur repeatedly, or it can stretch out, with minor regressions, over a period of years.

This confirms the serious nature of the problem and indicates the need for ongoing research into this phenomenon.

2.5 Burnout and Cognitive Dissonance

Individuals seek work in a particular field on the basis of their perception of the likelihood of obtaining rewards, either financial, status-related, or emotional. Research indicates that for individuals seeking social work careers, the value of working with people is the primary basis for selecting that occupation, in contrast to those who enter business for economic rewards.

Unfortunately, social workers spend only a small part of their time working directly with clients. The rest of the time is spent in transportation, paperwork and administrative tasks. The limited time for direct client contact creates a gap between the idealized concept of the caseworker's role and what occurs in practice. This discrepancy is not uncommon...and has been termed 'reality shock'.

'Reality shock' creates stress that may lead to burnout and turnover, since workers don't get the anticipated rewards from working with clients. (Daley, 1979)

Daley's conception of the problem suggests the model for burnout upon which this discussion is based. Festinger's
Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Festinger, 1957) is applicable to the aforementioned "gap" or "reality shock" and its attendant discomfort between that which the worker perceives as ideal and that which he perceives as actually occurring within his practice.

2.5.1 Theory of Cognitive Dissonance

Cognitive dissonance is a social psychological theory presented by Leon Festinger, in his book entitled, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. This section of the problem formulation is developed from the concepts preferred within that book.

Festinger maintains that essentially, "the individual strives toward consistency within himself" and that, "his opinions and attitudes...tend to exist in clusters that are internally consistent." Similarly, there exists, "the same kind of consistency between what a person knows or believes and what he does." Inconsistency results when a person acts or behaves in a manner which is not in keeping with his internalized values, morals, etc. This behavior may be voluntary or involuntary but these inconsistencies are rarely, and perhaps never accepted psychologically by an individual. Rather, a person will attempt to rationalize them away. Such attempts are not always successful; consequently, the inconsistencies simply remain. According to Festinger, "under such circumstances—that is, in the presence of an inconsistency—there is psychological discomfort."

The term he employs to describe "inconsistency" is "dissonance". Likewise, he replaces the word "consistency"
with the term "consonance". Dissonance is, "the existence of nonfitting relations among cognitions" and is seen as, "a motivating factor in its own right" in that the individual is motivated to resolve the dissonance and achieve equilibrium. By the term cognition he means, "any knowledge, opinion, or belief about the environment, about oneself or about one's behaviour." Accordingly, he prefers that cognitive dissonance, "can be seen as an antecedent condition which leads to activity oriented toward dissonance reduction, just as hunger leads to activity oriented toward hunger reduction."

The essence of this theory may be summarized as follows:

1. There may exist dissonant or 'nonfitting' relations among cognitive elements.
2. The existence of dissonance gives rise to pressures to reduce the dissonance and to avoid increases in dissonance.
3. Manifestations of the operation of these pressures include behaviour changes, changes of cognition, and circumspect exposure to new information and new opinions.

2.5.2 Cognitive dissonance as it relates to burnout

Billingsley (1964) makes the point that a social worker employed within an agency setting is, "involved in and must somehow respond to the expectations of a number of subsystems." He refers to four primarily occupational subsystems which are the worker's agency, his profession, his clients and the community in which he works. Just as these subsystems have expectations of the worker, so too the worker has expectations of the subsystem and of himself. Should these expectations which are rooted in one's cognitions (eg. values, community and agency support, working conditions) be thwarted or unmet
in actuality, it is likely that "psychological discomfort" will occur resulting in what Festinger (1957) refers to as "cognitive dissonance". As previously indicated, the existence of dissonance gives rise to pressures to reduce itself. Thus, discomfort precipitated by the presence of and attempts to reduce or avoid further dissonance can be seen as stressful. According to (Mechanis; MacGrath, 1967) Cognitive Dissonance is a theory of "stress reduction" which can be viewed, "within the context of coping with the discomfort or stress resulting from conflicting or incompatible cognitions." The researchers speculate that, should an individual be subjected to continuous and increasing pressure due to unmet job expectations that person will, in fact, become burned out and that the amount of stress and ultimate degree of burnout which a person encounters is subjective, i.e., it is predicated upon the individual's own perceptions and cognitions or perceptual cognitive screen. McRath (1967) maintains that "stress or threat only occurs when the consequences of failure to meet (a) demand are important, or rather, when they are perceived by the organism to be important." The key term here is the word perception. For, "stress exists not in an imbalance between objective demand and the organism's response capability, but in an imbalance between perceived or subjective demand and perceived response capability" (McRath 1967). According to Freudenberger (1977b), "this dichotomy between what exists and what the sufferer perceives as existing makes burnout difficult to deal with."

This subjectivity to which McRath and Freudenberger
ascribe can be seen as problematic in the attempt to define, prevent and help people cope with burnout. According to Daley's (1979a) discussion of burnout, "...the problem inherent in defining stresses on an individual basis is that a person's perceptions of stress are related to his or her personality. In other words, what may provoke a stress reaction in one individual may not do so in another. This implies that the remediation of stress must be conducted on the basis of individual diagnosis and that plans to prevent burnout must be individually tailored to each worker." Koriat et. al. (1972) support this view as they maintain that, "in life, ... emotional appraisals are largely self-generated; the person subjected to the threat of harm must, through his own cognitive efforts, find a way of managing the situation and/or the emotional reaction it generates."

Meyer (1977) addresses this stress management which she terms "mental gymnastics" and maintains that it precipitates "demotivation" on the job resulting in a decrease of productivity:

...observable... are the symptoms of stress. These symptoms are the result of mental gymnastics. Basically, the employee is asking the question 'What is happening? Is it me, the boss, or my work?' The need to answer these questions comes from mixed messages and mixed perceptions. What the employee wants to perceive and does perceive are not congruent. The effort of clarifying the mixed messages diverts attention from the tasks to be done resulting in diminished productivity.

It is apparent that this additional effort increases stress in an already stressful situation resulting in the worker becoming more burned out and ultimately delivering poorer service to his clients.
2.5.3 Expectations

As previously mentioned, workers not only have expectations of themselves as individuals but also of their profession, of their agencies, of their clients and of the community in which they work. Within this section, we propose to examine expectations as they relate to burnout.

In this study, expectations will be measured on the basis of twenty-seven variables, chosen from the literature (as will be described in the Methodology chapter). Certain variables have been chosen randomly to illustrate this discussion and to aid comprehension.

2.5.3.1 Social worker's expectations of self. Copans et. al. (1979) make the point that "many persons who work with high risk families experience their own feelings, actions, doubts as evidence of their personal and professional unfitness." Maslach (1976) states that, "it is important that they understand their own motivations for entering their particular career and recognize the expectations they have for their work." Similarly, Freudengerber (1977a) makes the point that, "it is important for the worker to have an awareness of his/her motivation for seeking out this (kind of) work. In being dedicated and committed, it will be sensible to have personal insights that dedication based upon inadequate self awareness can lead to overexertion, fatigue and eventual poor job performance."

This point is supported by Lamb (1979) and Mattingly (1977b) who states that, "an inherent and stress-producing conflict exists between the worker's need and requirement to give and
the reality that he can never give enough."

An oft repeated phrase among protection service workers is, "I should be doing this" or "I ought to be doing that." Frequently workers become frustrated as it becomes abundantly clear that there is a large discrepancy between that which they idealistically aspire to achieve and that which in actuality they are able to accomplish. These two incompatible cognitions frequently result in a state of dissonance. Many find that the dissonance and resulting stress leading to burnout is so great that they are no longer able to cope. The researchers ascribe to Perlman and Hartman's (1979) definition of coping as the, "ability to make accurate assessments of one's situation and engage in valid decision making when frustrated, conflicted or pressured." Perlman and Hartman further comment that the ego provides a person with a number of assumptions (or as Festinger (1957) would say, cognitions about the world) and that these assumptions "have marked influence on whether or not you experience stress or burnout and if so, to what degree." They delineate these assumptions into three specific categories which are:

1) Reality assumptions: views of how things are now in your life, the type of person you are now, the needs you have, etc.
2) The value assumption: the rights and wrongs, goods and bads, desirables and undesirables in your life.
3) The third assumptions are possibilities: how things progress, change, grow and be different.

The second assumption is directly applicable to our statement that workers frequently comment that they are not doing that which they should. "you assume you must do a great job,
must be perfect, must always come through for others, you 'should' yourself to death in the name of a higher good than perhaps even your own health or family's well being--that of qualify care giving." (Perlman and Hartman, 1979)

Commenting on staff burnout with long-term psychiatric patients Lamb (1979) maintains that, "motivations of self-gratification are rarely absent in members of the helping professions." He is quick to point out that these motivations are not necessarily bad in so far as the worker holds them in moderation but that they can adversely affect one's work, particularly if the individual is not cognizant that they exist. He specifically makes point that, "staff must ask themselves, 'to what extent am I in this field to get help for myself and to resolve my own problems? How much do I need to have contact with verbal, attractive patients to be admired and loved by them?"

In summation, inappropriate expectations of self by a social worker can lead to stress and ultimately result in burnout. Not only does the individual worker suffer, but his clients also receive diminished and/or inferior service.

2.5.3.2 Social workers expectations of clients. Oxley (1966) maintains that, "social workers need to examine their expectations of clients carefully in order to make them as realistically sound and constructively motivating as possible." He further insists that, "it is the worker's responsibility to use his professional skills to bring together in a conscious working relationship his and the client's expectations."
Previously, we referred to Perlman and Hartman's (1979) delineation of assumptions of the world as provided to an individual by his ego. They categorize one set of assumptions as "reality assumptions" under which fall questions pertaining to the type of individual a person is and the needs of that person as they exist in actuality. If a worker evaluates himself as an individual, as a professional or as both through the progress of his clients, it is likely that the clients and the worker will suffer a great injustice. Through unrealistic expectations placed upon the client by the worker, the client will come to play too great a role in validating the worth of a worker. As a result, the desired growth and enhancement in problem solving ability of the client is thwarted. Maslach (1978b) supports this view when she states, "the lack of change may be due to the nature of the client's problem (e.g. mental retardation, schizophrenia) or it may reflect a significant discrepancy between staff member's expectations and reality."

The expectations placed upon direct service workers by the various subsystems (Billingsley, 1964) are many and varied. As workers deliver service they may well expect or desire feedback, particularly from their clients directly. However, because of the nature of the work and clientele such feedback may be rare. Maslach (1978b) addresses this issue when she states, "for those whose major motivation to enter the helping professions was to make people's lives happier and healthier, the lack of positive feedback or 'strokes' from clients for one's accomplishments is a particularly bitter pill to swallow."
Mennerick (1974) talks about the roles of service work and client and states that these roles, "both incorporate various expectations and obligations implicitly agreed upon by both parties to guide each in his interaction." He suggests that difficulties may develop within these roles which result in workers classifying clients into what he refers to as "client typologies": "problems. . .develop in the worker client relationship when the client does not comply with the service worker's image of the ideal client. Workers tend to classify clients in terms of the way in which they vary from the ideal. Clients who facilitate workers' activities—who contribute to workers' efficiency—approach the ideal client type." He argues that these client typologies are used by workers to both bring order to their work and, "to help cope with the stress or conflict in the worker-client relationship." This can be explained in terms of the theory of cognitive dissonance (Festinger 1957). As the worker's perception of his own effectiveness decreases (as measured against an ideal he has set for himself) he encounters psychological discomfort or dissonance and thus stress, which he will attempt to reduce. The use of client typologies allows him to do this by placing responsibility upon the client thereby reducing the responsibility for himself. Mennerick (1974) sums this up when he states simply that, "self confident workers will tend to differentiate among clients less frequently." As previously mentioned, Maslach (1976) carries this one step further by stating that workers who are burned out from stress and unable
to cope further, "begin to defend themselves not only by thinking of clients in more derogatory terms but even by believing that the clients somehow deserve any problems they have."

2.5.3.3 Social worker's expectations of agency:

You see a lot of people who come with very idealistic ideas that 'I am going to be a social worker who is going to resolve a lot of problems.' Then they are confronted by the problems, the red tape, the bureaucracy. At first they're rebellious and angry. And then the symptoms of burnout set in.

This statement was made to a Toronto newspaper, the Globe & Mail, by Brian O'Neal, a supervisor for the Toronto Catholic Children's Aid Society. It is reflective of many enthusiastic workers who assume CAS positions with a commitment to practicing their profession within those organizations and in turn expect the organizations to facilitate this practice. All too often this does not occur, for as O'Neal states, "the CAS makes great demands on these people. They're investigating cases, taking families to court while at the same time trying to be their therapist, which is conflicting to say the least."

Whereas, the worker expects to find at least some professional fulfillment within the organization, according to Ron Arellano, executive director of Toronto Catholic Children's Aid Society, a frequent occurrence is "a feeling of frustration and helplessness. Frustration in a sense that you know under certain circumstances you could accomplish a lot of things. But people get overwhelmed, immobilized by all the demands and pressures and find they simply can't cope." (Arellano; Malarek, 1979). Styza (1972) comments upon the role of public welfare workers
which we feel is frequently the dilemma of CAS workers and in particular those with heavy caseloads: "no time for the social work theories of id and ego, transference relationship or detailed treatment plan that were taught in college. They were replaced instead by harsh realism: you are an "establishment" social work clerk with too much work and not enough time."

In other words, the expectations for practice which the worker has for himself within the organization and which the organization has for the employee-worker are not the same. There exists a dissonant relationship. Kadushin (1974) illustrates this problem when he comments that, "the child welfare worker's professional orientation emphasized voluntarism and self determination, but the job frequently requires him to seek legal sanctions and other action that is in opposition to the parent's wishes." Billingsley (1964) prefers the same point of view: "...the social worker in a child protective agency is required to be a kindly, understanding, nonjudgmental and accepting therapist, and at the same time a firm, resolute, determined representative of the formal authority of community norms." The duality of roles may well create role conflict, (one of the variables chosen for study) and lead to burnout.

Freudenberger (1977b) makes the point that workers should "be given the benefit of an awareness of both long-range as well as short-range goals for the clients as well as the agency." It is essential that workers not only be made aware of such goals but that they be allowed to participate in the formulation of these goals and in decisions regarding them. This position
is supported by Kermish and Kushin (1969), who indicate that participatory decision making is "crucial to questions of morale, which in turn directly affect turnover rates."

2.5.3.4 Social worker's expectations of the community.

John Meyers, a Toronto Children's Aid Society family service worker, was recently quoted as indicating that public expectation is one of the most difficult things for social workers to cope with. "The public expects us not to make mistakes and to intervene in every area immediately. That's far from possible, but if something should happen we're held to blame." (Meyers; Malarek, 1979). A similar sentiment is echoed in another recent statement from a Toronto CAS worker who describes her work as a "no-win situation". She indicates always having to "justify the agency to the people. We don't swoop down and steal babies for something to do. If people could know more of what we do and some of the odds we're up against there would be more sympathy for CAS." (Steinberg; London Free Press, 1979).

There is a paucity of information within the literature as to the expectations that direct service social workers have of the community. However, from the above statements it is clear that workers expect greater community understanding, support and protection than they are presently receiving. With respect to client dissatisfaction with workers, Maslach (1978b) states:

Clients often accuse staff of being cold, unfeeling, incompetent and even cruel. At times, they are more likely to view staff as adversaries than as aides, and feel that staff are only putting more stumbling blocks
in their path. Or they may accuse staff people of selling out to an oppressive system by becoming a part of it. Whatever form these complaints take, they all serve to identify the professional staff as the source of the client's difficulties in dealing with the service bureaucracy. And if bad people are the problem, then the commonly proposed solution is to get better (i.e., more caring, more humane) people to staff these institutions.

Warnath and Shelton (1971) suggest that frequently workers receive neither the status nor the community support which they require and feel they deserve. Once again, a dissonant situation is created as workers wrestle with the incongruency between the way in which the community perceives them (i.e. as an non crucial, soft service) and the way in which they wish to be perceived. According to Pines & Kafry (1978), "in the traditional client-centered orientation shared by most health and service professions, the focus is almost exclusively on the client, and not enough attention is given to the stresses encountered by the professional." For the social worker is "subjected to the projected hostility and criticism of anxious, sick people and of a frightened and immature society." (Babcock, 1953). As Watson points out, it is a social work function to absorb stress from both directions. (Watson, 1979).

It is natural to assume that workers will be provided with the "social utilities" (Kahn, 1965) that they require. According to Kahn these social utilities are seen as, "normal institutional arrangements, operating singly and as a network to meet normal human needs in contemporary urban civilization." For the CAS worker these might include such things as group and foster homes, home-maker services, public health, other medical services and a recreational and treatment center for
children, to name a few.

Social workers as individuals have personal standards of professional conduct and service, as does the profession as a whole. Should the worker not have the social utilities available to him which allow him to perform his function effectively, stress may develop. This stress in turn may contribute to burnout as the worker attempts to resolve the dissonance created by the perception that the resources he requires to do a good job are unavailable. Pines and Kafry (1978) support this position by their comment that, "...working intensely with (people) over an extended period of time involves...a good deal of stress, depending on the particular demands of the job (and the) resources that are available to the professional."

Social work's expectations of the community are aptly summed up within the preamble to the code of ethics for social workers approved by the board of directors of Canadian Association of Social Workers in October, 1977: "The profession of social work affirms that society has an obligation to ensure that all people have access to resources, services and opportunities they require to promote their well-being; and that each person has the right to self-determination with due regard to the interests of others."

2.5.3.5 Social worker's expectations of the profession.

"The standards that social workers set for themselves are truly beyond their grasp. Finding dignity and worth in every human being and accepting and seeking to understand each person one
meets represent an impossible dream." (Filsecker, 1978).

These standards and values are incorporated within the code of ethics for social workers previously referred to, and are implicitly and explicitly taught within professional schools of social work. The profession too often espouses that its members adhere to the ideal rather than to reality, which by definition is contradictory and dissonance producing, resulting in stress and eventual burnout. Social workers have the right not only to expect support from the profession but also to insist that the profession and in particular schools of social work clearly delineate the ideal from the real. Recently, Harry Zwerver, Associate Director of the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies was quoted as placing substantial blame for burnout on schools of social work, maintaining that young social workers are inadequately prepared for practice. "Until they get into it, they don't understand what reality is." (Zwerver; Malarek, 1979). A key term in Zwerver's statement is "preparation". Lack of adequate preparation for working in less-than-ideal situations, or what Styza (1972) refers to as "reality shock", can have serious effects not only upon the individual but upon the profession as a whole. "Confused by the contradictions between their ideals and the demands of their work setting and uncertain of their value to the institution or community within which they work, counselors can only wonder whether a career in counselling is worth the psychological cost. Many simply answer "No" and begin looking for other outlets for their talents." (Warnath and Shelton, 1976).
CAS work is frequently a less-than-ideal situation. A variable which clearly illustrates this point with respect to workers who exhaustively strive for the ideal is role conflict. This is aptly portrayed by Kadushin (1974) as he states, "there is...conflict between the social worker's image of what he should be doing and what he can do, given the nature of the client group. Warranted intervention implies severity, but increased severity and treatability are often inversely related."

2.5.3.6 Summary. This discussion has presented the negative impact of unmet expectations on the individual and the prevalence of unmet job expectations in the field of child protective services. It was argued that these unmet expectations are the key element in burnout among social workers. This study attempts to explore that connection.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Selection of a Specific Population and Sample

The decision to study burnout in Children's Aid Societies (CAS), the prime agent of child welfare and protective services in the province of Ontario was predicated upon two factors. First, the researcher's personal experience as employees of three different Ontario CAS's left them with some awareness and appreciation of the stresses encountered in protective services that apparently led to low morale, burnout and high rates of turnover. They speculated that the system was willing to sacrifice a large number of professional social workers in the worthy cause of protecting the lives and well-being of children. Pines and Kafry (1978) agree that "because of the client-centered orientation shared by social service professionals...not enough attention is given to the stresses encountered by the professional." Second, there are serious implications for the profession of social work as a whole. A survey of the National Association of Social Workers in the United States conducted by Stramm (1969) revealed that "child welfare services in various settings (institutional, non-institutional, court and school) continue to command the largest single group of respondents (27 percent)." With such a large proportion of social workers employed in the child
welfare sector, it is important that the profession invest time and effort in exploring the conditions experienced by workers there.

As a result of this personal experience and involvement, the researchers surveyed the literature dealing with stress and burnout among protective service workers. For example, since burnout was "alleged to be rampant in protective service agencies," the Berkeley Planning Associates (1977) dedicated a book solely to the problem of burnout in their evaluation of child abuse and neglect demonstration projects across the United States. They found that the average social worker changes jobs every two years and attribute this to estrangement from their current job and a quest for meaningful employment. They go on to specify turnover rates for the eleven projects participating in the study. The average rate was 65% over thirty months of operation with a range from 11% to 133%. Seven projects had rates of over 40%.

The Planning Associates distributed burnout questionnaires to workers in the project and found that out of 125 respondents, 40 felt that they were burned out and an additional 42 felt that they were moderately burned out. Almost 50% of those under the age of thirty were burned out (and an additional 30% moderately burned out) as were almost 50% of those who had been employed between one and two years (with an additional 33% moderately burned out). These figures indicate that even if these figures represent the most liberal of estimates, burnout is, in fact, rampant among protective service workers.
Kadushin (1974) reports that, "although all child welfare agencies face the problem of personnel shortage and high turnover rates, the protective service agencies face particular problems in recruiting staff, especially professionally trained social workers." The overall turnover rate for child welfare workers (about 30%) is considerably higher than that of school-teachers or civil service employees (eight percent and 12% respectively). He also states that turnover rates are higher among public than among voluntary child welfare agencies. He attributes this to the involuntary nature of the clientele and the "apparent futility of (the workers') efforts."

Bandoli (1977) reports "high turnover among protective service personnel" while Daley states that "child welfare is prominent among areas with high burnout." Malarek (1979) quotes George Caldwell, executive director of the Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies (OACAS) as stating that front-line social workers employed by child-welfare agencies are among the hardest hit by burnout, as indicated by an annual turnover rate of about 22 percent and the fact that the average social worker changes jobs about every two years.

These statistics are supported by Resener's (1979) assertion that "Burnout is prevalent in... professions because of the constantly high emotional stress incurred in dealing daily with people who are dependent, sick, scared, distraught, upset, suspicious or violently angry." This aptly describes the client population in a protective service setting. Sourkes (1979) suggests that although burnout is "not the exclusive
domain of C.A.S. workers, ... we might build a cogent case for its prevalence on the basis of the caseload factor and the fiscal restrictions, which have had an uncanny way of being converted into an emotional and psychological toll-taking quotient." Hagmen (1979) asserts that burnout "plays a significant role in program failure in any area that deals with difficult, hard-to-manage children." Littner (1957) further asserts that child welfare work is stressful because it reactivates unconscious conflicts (i.e., the worker's childhood conflicts). Wasserman (1970) expounds on this point by stating that the child-welfare worker is "often overwhelmed by the cumulative terror of a large number of cases--by the human suffering, deprivation, disorder, ignorance, hostility and cruelty he must face as part of his every-day work situation."

Rosati (1974) reports a forty percent turnover rate at the Monroe County Department of Social Services in New York, a department that conducts child welfare as well as income maintenance programs. Most of those who had resigned had been with the agency less than two years, although substantial numbers of veteran employees also resigned. Because of these high rates of turnover, employees left even before they were able to assimilate the complex regulations and procedures within the agency and the agency was constantly staffed with inexperienced workers. Thus, much wasteful duplication of effort occurred, many errors were made and continuity of casework proved impossible.
Wasserman (1970) has also identified the seriousness of the turnover problem when he reported that, "after two years eight of the (twelve) new professionals left the agency for other employment. Six...left voluntarily and two left involuntarily. Among the voluntary terminations were the three who had felt overwhelmed and overburdened from the beginning of their professional work experience." He considers eight out of twelve a high attrition rate, "especially for an agency that had made great efforts to recruit new professionals." These workers often left the agency feeling that they were abandoning the children and clients with whom they worked but they were compelled to save themselves.

3.2 Classification of the Research

Hanley (1974) indicates that a study is exploratory insofar as the researchers wish to "explore a problem area in which there has been little or no research performed and consequently there are no precise hypotheses to be tested." Selltiz (1967) states that a study is descriptive insofar as it is intended to, "portray accurately the characteristics of a particular...or to determine the frequency with which something occurs or with which it is associated with something else." Tripodi (1969) indicates that, "combined exploratory-descriptive studies are those exploratory studies which seek to thoroughly describe a particular phenomenon," and that "the purpose of these studies it to develop ideas and theoretical generalizations." This research project is therefore an exploratory descriptive study in that the
researchers have sought to study scientifically, a phenomenon which has usually been examined from a subjective point of view from the perspective of personal experience and observation. Rather than testing precise hypotheses, the researchers addressed three research questions which will be presented later in this chapter. This study is descriptive in that the researchers have examined the characteristics of a "particular group" (i.e. burned-out direct service workers in selected Ontario CAS's). They have also investigated whether or not there is a relationship between a number of independent variables and the dependent variable burnout. Where such a relationship has been found, the nature of that relationship has been examined.

3.3 Study Design

A review of the literature yielded a possible ninety-nine independent variables for study. These variables were cited by authors as factors which are associated with and/or lead to burnout. The researchers selected twenty-seven of these variables for examination by combining similar concepts, by attending to those which most frequently appeared in the literature and judging those that would be most relevant, based upon the researchers previous knowledge and experience in the area under study. Those variables which were significantly related with worker burnout were subsequently determined by means of statistical tests. This approach to the study of burnout was deemed appropriate since there has been little empirical research conducted in this area. At this stage of the research
into burnout it is far more appropriate to determine the most significant factors so that they may be studied in greater depth in subsequent studies.

The researchers basic premise that unmet job expectations may lead to burnout is novel theorizing that has been alluded to but not addressed in the literature. From the outset of the study it was suspected that the findings would show that the workers who were most severely burned out would be those who had experienced the largest discrepancy between their perceptions of conditions they expected to encounter at CAS and their perceptions of the actual working conditions they had encountered. Accordingly, the exploratory design is appropriate in that we wished to "gain familiarity with a phenomenon or to achieve new insights into it, in order to formulate a more precise research problem or to develop hypotheses." (Selzitz 1967)

The researchers have attempted to develop a profile of burned out CAS workers based upon the demographic data derived from the responses to Part A of the questionnaire (See Appendix I). The development of this profile will be discussed under a subsequent heading.

3.4 Research Questions

The three research questions are as follows:

1) Are unmet job expectations of CAS workers related to the syndrome of burnout?

2) What factors derived from the literature are most highly correlated with the incidence of burnout in Ontario CAS workers?
3) What is the profile of burned out CAS workers in Ontario?

3.5 The Population

The population for this research project consisted of all direct service social workers in all Southern Ontario Children's Aid Societies west of Toronto.

Six agencies agreed to participate in the study and all insisted that their anonymity be maintained as a condition of participation. Thus, no information has been presented that would provide clues as to the identity of any social worker or agency that took part in this study.

The first Children's Aid Society was established in the city of Toronto in 1893. Children's Aid Societies are the primary child welfare agencies in the province of Ontario. They are mandated by the Child Welfare Act (1978) to provide service in the areas of: (1) the protection and care of children (Part II of the Act) and (2) adoption (Part III).

The protection and care of children requires the greatest investment of human and fiscal resources by the agencies because of the vast array of services provided and strategies utilized. Protective services in Ontario include the investigation of allegations that a child is in need of protection as defined in Section 19(1)(b) of the Child Welfare Act and intervention ranging from counselling in the home to apprehension of the child and obtaining wardship on his behalf should counselling fail to ensure that the emotional and physical needs of the child are met.

This is considered to be a high stress occupation because
of the responsibility of each worker to carry out the legislated mandate and because clients are often involuntary and difficult to work with. A number of social workers however, view this setting as providing them with unique opportunities to develop and practice a broad range of social work skills. Thus, research into burnout among this group of social workers is particularly relevant if it sheds light upon the actual extent of the problem and upon the circumstances that may predispose an individual to either stagnate within or decide to leave the job.

3.5.1 The Sample

The researchers visited the six participating agencies and personally administered the questionnaires to those direct service social workers who were available to complete the questionnaire at the time of the prearranged visits. A total of one hundred twenty eight social workers from the selected agencies participated in the study.

A purposive sample was utilized in this study. It is purposive in that the researchers based their choice of agencies (subject to the agency's approval) upon the criteria of convenience and economy for the researchers. Since there was no reason to believe that any of the chosen agencies would be atypical when compared with other Ontario CAS's, it was felt that the sample would be "satisfactory in relation to (our) needs." (Selltiz et. al. 1976). This is also a nonprobability sample in that there were workers absent (and therefore unable to respond) when the questionnaires were
distributed and participating workers were not chosen or assigned randomly. Thus, there was "no assurance that every element (had) some chance of being included" (Selltiz et. al. 1976).

The actual sample consisted of 107 social workers because those completed questionnaires with five or more missing items were deleted from the sample. Table 3.5.1 represents a demographic profile of the actual sample.

It may be seen that the vast majority of respondents were female and married, and that almost one half of the sample was thirty years old or younger. The B.S.W. was the most prevalent academic qualification but fully 43% of the sample had no formal training in social work. Slightly more than one half of the respondents were employed in a family service department. The majority of respondents worked 30 to 39 hours per week (indicative of the fact that most CAS's enjoy a work week of less than 40 hours per week), although a significant proportion of respondents (38.3%) work 40 to 49 hours per week. There was wide variation in the number of hours per week spent in direct contact with clients so that no pattern is evident.

Finally, whereas a substantial number of respondents had worked at their present agency (35.5%) and in child welfare (53.3%) for more than four years, there was also a very high number of respondents who had been in their present position (45.9%) and in the field of child welfare (27.1%) for two years or less. This would indicate that these agencies enjoy a core of stable staff but that there is also a very high turnover
### Table 3.5.1

**Demographic Profile of Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number in Sample</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
<th>Measures of Central Tendency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>mode = 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>(female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years or less</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>mean = 33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>median = 35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>mode = 35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-53 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>mode = 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>married</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>(married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other/no answer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diploma</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>mode = 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. (Gen'l or Maj)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>(B.A. (Gen'l or Maj))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.W.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (R.N., M.Ed., etc.)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Services</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>mode = 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Serv.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>(family services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other/missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hours Worked per Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>mode = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>(30-39 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 30/missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 6 mo.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 6 &amp; 12 mo.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 1 &amp; 2 yr.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 2 &amp; 3 yr.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 3 &amp; 4 yr.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 4 yr.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per Week Spent in Direct Contact With Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or less/missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>mean = 3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>(11-15 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>mode = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>(21-25 hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** all totals = 107 respondents and all percentages total 100% within each category. Any deviations are due to rounding errors.
rate that results in the hiring of replacement staff with limited experience.

3.6 The Pretest

A pretest was conducted by the researchers at a South Western Ontario Children's Aid Society. The procedure employed throughout the pretest was identically followed throughout the visits to each of the five remaining agencies.

The purpose of this pretest was to obtain feedback from the respondents regarding the structure and format of the research instrument. For example, the researchers were concerned that perhaps the questionnaire might have been too lengthy, that the language used may not have been easily comprehended and that the order of the four subsections might have been inappropriate. The researchers also wished to determine whether any of the questions posed were irrelevant or whether any areas were excluded that the respondents may have felt were particularly relevant to burnout in child welfare. Finally, the researchers wished to determine whether the number and categories of responses were too limiting, inclusive or vague so that the respondents may have been unable to choose from among them.

The procedure for approaching the pretest agency was as follows: a letter was written to the executive director of the respective agency requesting permission to carry out the pretest at that agency (see Appendix A) and assuring that confidentiality would be maintained. Upon receiving approval to carry out the pretest the researchers requested to meet with the
direct service workers as a group and administer the question-
naire to the group rather than individually so as to stand-
ardize the procedure. A staff meeting was arranged through
the executive director or his appointee, to be attended by all
available direct service social workers (that is, those who
were not on vacation, ill or responding to crises). The two
researchers attended this meeting and were introduced by the
chairperson as two M.S.W. students from the University of
Windsor who were conducting a survey of certain Southern
Ontario CAS's. One of the researchers introduced himself (or
herself) and stated: "We would like to distribute this ques-
tionnaire and request that you answer each question carefully
and honestly. We shall not discuss the questionnaire before-
hand so as to avoid biasing your responses. However, we shall
explain the purpose of the study in detail once all completed
questionnaires are submitted. Thank you for your cooperation."

The researchers added that since this was a pretest,
feedback would be sought regarding ways in which the question-
aire might be improved. This was not stated at the five
remaining agencies.

The pretest group generally seemed enthusiastic and
cooperative and expressed approval regarding the quality of
the questionnaire. They expressed no criticism of the areas
outlined by the researchers. They identified two areas of
concern, both of which were related to section D of the
instrument, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (see Appendix C).
Some respondents felt that their responses to the statements
in section D would vary from day to day, depending upon their
mood and recent experiences. They suggested that the instrument may measure current mood rather than overall burnout. Some respondents also complained that they did not understand the question regarding "feeling similar to one's clients." An affirmative response could reflect an ability to empathize on the one hand or overidentify with the client on the other.

These criticisms were not considered as being significant in terms of research design because Maslach and Jackson in an unpublished article, "The Measurement of Burnout," clearly demonstrate the reliability and validity of the M.B.I. and each of the questions involved. These 25 items were chosen from 47 items that were administered to 605 health and service professionals. The final 25 were administered to another sample of 420. Factor analysis and test-retest data confirm the reliability of the instrument, while spouse, co-worker and Job Diagnostic Survey data confirm the validity of the instrument.

Since the pretest did not result in any changes to the instrument and since the procedure that was followed was identical to that which would be followed throughout the study proper, it was decided to include the pretest group in the research sample. This decision was further supported by the fact that the small number of cases obtained during the pretest was, taken alone, grossly inadequate for pretesting the planned statistical analyses.
3.7 Data Gathering Instrument

The data was gathered by means of a written questionnaire (see Appendix C), that was developed primarily by the researchers. The composition of this questionnaire will be discussed in detail later in this chapter.

There are a number of advantages to using a questionnaire as opposed to personal interviews. For example, the use of personal interviews increases the likelihood of bias, error and misinterpretation on the part of the interviewer. Questionnaires can be, "administered to large numbers of individuals simultaneously" (Selltiz et. al. 1967) thereby conserving time. This study involved both a large number of variables and a large sample of workers (128). Therefore, written closed ended or fixed alternative questions were used in order to provide standardized responses that were more efficiently compiled, coded and analyzed. Another advantage to the use of a questionnaire is that, since the researchers were measuring attitudes and feelings that might be a source of embarrassment to workers, the "respondents may have greater confidence in their anonymity" (Selltiz et. al. 1967). The anonymity that is guaranteed by a written questionnaire was expected to help respondents to be more honest and less inclined to choose a socially desirable response than had they been confronted in person by an interviewer.

In order, "to make clear the meaning of the question," (Selltiz 1967) and to facilitate the analysis of data, the demographic data was gathered by means of fixed alternative
questions. By providing the alternative responses and compelling the respondent to choose one, the researchers ensured less ambiguity as to the intent and content of each question. Fixed alternative questions were also used to elicit data concerning expectations, perceptions and burnout in order to "require the respondents themselves to make judgments about their attitudes rather than leaving this up to the interviewer or coder" (Selltiz et. al. 1967).

It can be argued that fixed alternatives do not allow for an in-depth analysis of data. This is not an important consideration in that this study was not intended to examine any of the dimensions in depth. Selltiz et. al. (1967) have suggested that fixed alternatives may force "a statement of opinion on an issue about which the respondent does not have any opinion." However, the researchers have dealt with this problem by providing the respondent with a "don't know" option.

With the exception of the demographic data, everything that the researchers sought to measure was subjective. For example, original expectations were measured in terms of memories; current conditions were measured according to the worker's perception of the way it is and burnout was measured upon the basis of how the respondent perceived his or her attitudes and feelings. Selltiz et. al. (1967) report that, "self-ratings have so far proved to be the only satisfactory source of information regarding attitudes." Accordingly, these dimensions were all appropriately measured by means of a self report.
The researchers employed a Likert-type scale to measure expectations, perceptions and the degree of burnout. It is Likert-type in that, "subjects are asked to respond to each item in terms of several degrees of agreement or disagreement." (Selltiz et. al. 1967). The Maslach Burnout Inventory, a standardized instrument, was used to measure burnout. The researchers chose five scale positions to measure expectations and perceptions because it was not expected that people would be able to make fine distinctions among varying degrees of perceptions and memories.

The expectations and perceptions scales differ dramatically from a true Likert scale in that there are not a number of questions addressing each dimension or variable being studied. Consequently, the researchers were unable to statistically test the reliability or validity of their measuring device. The decision to employ, a priori, a maximum number of different items was deliberate in keeping with the exploratory nature of the study. The inclusion of more than one item per variable would have resulted in a prohibitively long instrument. The researchers are in agreement with the members of the thesis committee that the statements contained in the questionnaire are relevant to the variables being studied and satisfy the validity requirements of an exploratory study.

In summary, the research instrument was developed by the researchers who completed an extensive review of the literature; isolated a possible 99 variables for study; grouped these variables into similar categories and chose 27 of these cate-
gories based on the criteria previously outlined. Labels or variables representative of these 27 categories were chosen and questions were designed to study each.

These questions were constructed and revised in accordance with the "Guide for Questionnaire Construction" (Sellitiz et al. 1967). The researchers believe that the content and wording of the questions are appropriate insofar as: (a) all the questions are necessary and the subject area can be covered with the number of questions chosen, (b) the respondents possess the information to answer the questions, (c) a balance has been struck between specificity and generality, (d) the questions themselves are unbiased and the wording is clear (Sellitiz et al. 1967). The researchers used personalized wording because they sought to measure the attitudes and feelings of individuals and wanted to determine the subjective perceptions of respondents. The questions are directly related to the variables under study to reduce confusion and increase validity.

The questions are placed in random order since intermingling the variables would prevent a strong reaction to any one variable from influencing one's response to similar variables within the same section.

Vroom (1964) states that there is a tendency to choose the first alternative on questionnaires such as this. This results in high scores indicating a high level of either satisfaction or dissatisfaction. There is conclusive evidence that people vary in the extent to which they will agree with
a statement regardless of its content. This lends support to the idea that acquiescence, might be the basis for a generalized positive or negative response in a study of this kind. The role of acquiescence can be eliminated by constructing half of the items so that an "agree" response connotes dissatisfaction and the other half of the items so that a "disagree" response connotes satisfaction. This procedure was carried out on the expectations and perceptions items.

3.7.1 Demographic Data

As previously mentioned, Part A of the questionnaire was included to provide a demographic profile of burned-out versus non burned-out CAS workers. Several hypotheses have been proposed in the literature regarding demography as it relates to burnout. For example, females are said to burnout more quickly than males (question one); single people more quickly than married people (question three); burnout decreases as educational level increases (questions four and five); intake is the highest stress position in CAS (question six); burnout increases as hours of work increase (question seven); burnout increases as proportions of time in direct contact with clients increases (questions ten and eleven); burnout increases as length of time in this field of work increases (questions eight and nine); and burnout becomes more prevalent as one becomes older (question two). It has been our intention to ascertain which, if any of the relationships are operative in CAS workers.

This section is based upon the demographic material col-
lected by Maslach as part of her burnout inventory. The researchers made numerous changes to "Canadianize" the material, to use differential scales rather than open ended questions and to delete specific variables that were not of high priority in this study (e.g. race and religion).

3.7.2 Expectations & Perceptions

The purpose of Part B of the questionnaire was to measure what conditions the individual expected to find upon accepting employment at CAS. Expectations in each of the 27 areas chosen for study are operationally defined as the score for each item on the expectations scale. Part C is designed to measure how the individual perceives conditions at this point in time. Perceptions in each of the 27 areas are operationally defined as the score for each item on the perceptions scale. Overall perceptions are operationally defined as the sum of all the perceptions scores. There is one question in Part B designed to measure each of the 27 variables which were selected from the literature; there is a parallel question in Part C designed to measure perceptions regarding each variable. By comparing the responses to parallel questions, the researchers expected to find that the people who scored highest on the Burnout Inventory displayed the greatest discrepancy between their original expectations and their current perceptions of actual conditions (unmet job expectations). Unmet job expectations are operationally defined as the difference between the expectations and perceptions for each of the twenty seven variables. A list of question numbers and the conceptual
variables which the questions are expected to measure are presented in Table 3.7.2. These variables have been drawn from the literature on burnout.

**Table 3.7.2**

Conceptual Variables Measured in Each Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Conceptual Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nature of Client (i.e. involuntary, hostile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Decision Making (within the agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Role Conflict (helper vs. investigator or punisher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Status of the Profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-on responsibility for the physical well-being and lives of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to use professional skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Court Involvement (spending a disproportionate amount of time preparing for and in court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for Advancement (in clinical area as opposed to administrative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship with Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of tangible results from one's efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical environment (conducive in terms of space, privacy, decor, quiet, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training preparing one for emotional involvement (with people in pain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Numbers</td>
<td>Conceptual Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Professional values (acceptance, unconditional positive regard)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nature of the work (focus on negatives and suffering)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Separating work and home life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Propensity to challenge the system or innovate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Community expectations and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Caseload size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Opportunities for work breaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Availability of personal and professional support groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Types of cases (explosive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Availability of social and recreational outlets outside work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Opportunities for positive feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Salary levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hours of work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Amount of time spent in direct contact with the client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was expected that not all these variables would be highly correlated with burnout as measured on the Maslach Burnout Inventory (M.B.I.). Each of these variables have been compared with scores on the M.B.I. in order to determine which are statistically significant in terms of correlation.
3.7-3 The Maslach Burnout Inventory (M.B.I.)

This final section of the survey was borrowed from Dr. Christina Maslach of the University of California, Berkeley. The M.B.I. is an instrument developed by Maslach to measure burnout in a number of occupations. The instrument measures burnout by requiring respondents to rate themselves according to the frequency and intensity of feelings that have been found to be highly correlated with burnout. The 25 items comprising the M.B.I. are categorized into four subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment and personal involvement. (See Appendix B). In an unpublished article entitled, "The Measurement of Experienced Burnout," Maslach reports that these four factors accounted for 100% of the variance between burned out workers and those who were not burned out. The personal involvement subscale has a somewhat weaker correlation than the other three and is considered optional. However, the researchers have decided to include all subscales in this survey.

This scale has been used in order to determine the degree to which respondents experience burnout. By correlating scores on the Expectations and Perception Scales with scores on the M.B.I., the researchers have determined which factors are most highly associated with burnout. By comparing the differences between the Expectations and Perceptions scales with scores on the M.B.I., the researchers have determined whether or not unmet job expectations relate to burnout. By comparing the demographic data obtained from our sample with the M.B.I., a
profile of burned out CAS workers in southwestern Ontario has been developed and contrasted with the low burnout group. Burnout is operationally defined as each individual's sum of scores on the M.B.I.

3.8 Statistical Analysis of Data

The statistical techniques applied to the data are briefly described below so that the reader will understand the rationale for using each test.

3.8.1 Factor Analysis

"Factor analysis is a statistical technique that enable(s) us to see whether some underlying pattern of relationships exist such that the data may be . . . reduced to a smaller set of . . . components that may be taken as source variables accounting for the observed interrelations in the data" (Nie et. al. 1975). Nie et. al. (1975) go on to explain that "the exploration and detection of patterning of variables with a view of the discovery of new concepts and a possible reduction of data" is a common application of factor analysis. Because of the large number of items on each of the scales, factor analysis was performed on each of the scales in this study.

Specifically, principal components analysis with iteration and varimax rotations was used to "transform a given set of variables into a new set of composite variables or principal components that are unrelated to one another." (Nie et. al. 1975). In principal component analysis, "the first principal component may be viewed as the single best summary of . . . relationships in the data" while the second component is
considered the second best combination of variables, and so on. Thus, the second component accounts for the proportion of variance not accounted for by the first, and so on, until all variance is accounted for.

Iteration automatically estimates commonality (i.e. the proportion of a variable sharing something in common with other variables in the set) and therefore simplifies analysis by reducing the number of factors. Varimax rotation further simplifies the data by accentuating among those elements that load high or low within the factor.

3.8.2 Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis

The factor scores obtained were then correlated to compute Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) for pairs of interval-level variables. These coefficients simply indicate the degree to which variation (or change) in one variable is related to variation in another (Nie et al., 1975) and whether this relationship is inverse or positive. The Pearson r is appropriate because the scales developed satisfy the criteria for interval level scales (i.e. distances between categories can be considered as fixed and equal but they do not indicate proportional magnitude).

3.8.3 Discriminant Analysis

Respondents were finally divided into groups of high, medium and low burnout, based on their scores on the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Then, discriminant analyses were performed to determine what factors best discriminate between the high and low burnout groups. A stepwise procedure was used to
select the single best discriminating variable, then to sequentially select the "next best" discriminator, given the variables already selected. Wilks lambda was used as the test of discrimination between groups because it takes into consideration the differences between all centroids (i.e. the means for each group on all discriminant functions) and the cohesion (or homogeneity) within groups.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The analysis of the data collected was more extensive than required to respond to the actual research questions. Since presentation of all the analyses performed would serve only to detract from the research question, much peripherally related data is included in the appendices for the perusal of the interested reader.

The analysis and findings are presented in two major sections. First, the instruments utilized were analysed in order to reduce the amount of data to be dealt with. The analysis of these instruments included correlation analysis of Maslach's subscales applied to this data, principal components analysis of each instrument, second order principal components analysis of the M.B.I., and an explanation of difference scores.

The second section of this chapter is named Major Results and deals with analysis of the data with respect to the research questions. This section includes a comparison of the mean expectation, perception and difference scores for each item, correlation analysis of M.B.I. factors interrelated with expectations, perceptions and difference factors as well as discriminant analysis of all variables and factors.
4.1 Analysis of Instruments

4.1.1 Maslach's Subscales Applied to This Data

As previously mentioned, when Maslach (personal communication) performed principal components analysis on the M.B.I. for her sample, four components were identified. These were considered subscales of the M.B.I. and were named Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Achievement and Personal Involvement (see Appendix C). The researchers calculated the sums for each of these subscales by simply adding the scores for the items included in each of Maslach's identified subscales. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) Analysis was then performed on the subscales.

Table 4.1.1 indicates that for this sample of Ontario CAS workers, the Maslach subscales are highly intercorrelated. For example, the depersonalization subscale is correlated with the emotional exhaustion subscale at a level of $r = .55$ ($p < .0001$) and with the personal involvement subscale at a level of $r = .43$ ($p < .0001$); the personal involvement subscale is correlated with the emotional exhaustion subscale at a level of $r = .35$ ($p < .0001$) and the personal achievement subscale is correlated with the emotional exhaustion subscale at a level of $r = .17$ ($p < .05$). Table 4.1.1 also indicates that the four subscales are highly correlated with the sum of all M.B.I. items, which is to be expected since the sum of all M.B.I. items is calculated by adding the sums of the four subscales. However, the intercorrelations among the four subscales indicates that these subscales do not represent an optimal descrip-
tation of the components of burnout for this sample of Ontario GAS workers (since principal components are, by definition, independent). Thus, it was evident that separate principal components analyses of the M.B.I. must be conducted.

TABLE 4.1.1
MASLACH'S FOUR SUBSCALES INTERCORRELATED USING PEARSON'S PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS (r)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Personal Achievement</th>
<th>Personal Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>*)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of M.B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | *****               | *****             | *****               | *****              |

|                      | 87                  | 74                | 50                  | 57                 |

**** p < .0001
*  p < .05

NOTE: 1) appendix D presents a more detailed analysis.
2) on this table, correlation coefficients are rounded off to two decimal places and decimal points are removed.

4.1.2 Principal Components Analysis

As previously mentioned, principal components analysis of the items of each of the five major sets of questionnaire items (i.e. M.B.I. frequencies, M.B.I. intensities, perceptions, expectations and differences) were performed by first intercorrelating the items in a set, then performing a principal
components analysis, followed by varimax rotation of items with eigenvalues greater than one. This was done in order to reduce the amount of data to be analysed. Items were considered to load on a factor only if their factor loadings were .49 or greater. In factor descriptions, questionnaire items are followed by "agree" or "disagree" in parentheses to indicate the meaning of a high score.

4.1.2.1 Maslach burnout inventory. Three separate principal components analyses were performed on the items of the M.B.I. in order to determine which analysis reduced the data to its simplest form: one analysis included both the frequency and intensity items while the other involved separate analyses of frequency items and intensity items. The factor scores for the combined scales are presented in Appendix E. However, these factors were not used for further analysis for reasons to be explained later.

4.1.2.2 M.B.I. frequencies items. Table 4.1.2.2 presents the principal components analysis of M.B.I. frequency items. It may be seen that eight factors emerge which account for 67.9% of the variance. Factor I was named Frequency of Tedium because it consists of items related to feeling drained from facing an unpleasant task or situation for too long a period of time. The five items that loaded on this factor in order of size of factor loading are: "I feel used up at the end of the day" (agree); "I feel emotionally drained from my work" (agree); "I feel frustrated by my job" (agree); "I feel that I am working too hard on my job" (agree) and "I feel fatigued when
TABLE 4.2.2.2
PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS OF FREQUENCIES SCORES (M.B.I.):
LOADINGS OF M.B.I. FREQUENCIES ITEMS ON FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
<th>Factor VII</th>
<th>Factor VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor #1: Frequency of Tedium</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel used up at end of workday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel frustrated by my job</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I feel I'm working too hard on my job</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #2: Frequency of Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel like I'm at the end of my rope</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Working directly with people puts too much stress on me</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>07.19</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Working with people all day is really a strain for me</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
<td>-13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #3: Frequency of Lack of Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I deal very effectively with the problems of my clients</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>07.87</td>
<td>-13.14</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>59.28</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) My work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-15.12</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>02.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-02.04</td>
<td>04.02</td>
<td>-41.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel clients blame me for some of their problems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>07.87</td>
<td>-13.14</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I don't really care what happens to my clients</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>59.28</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.56</td>
<td>56.35</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #5: Frequency of Callousness</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I've become more callous toward people since I took this job</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-04.22</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td>-06.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel I treat some clients as if they were impersonal &quot;objects&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #6: Frequency of Intense Emotional Involvement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>59.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel personally involved with my clients' problems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>76.32</td>
<td>-37.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel very energetic</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>-37.08</td>
<td>-08.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel exhilarated after working closely with my clients</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>45.14</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>-04.04</td>
<td>09.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #7: Frequency of Identification With Clients</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>07.07</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel similar to my clients in many ways</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>07.07</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>01.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor #8: Frequency of Lack of Empathy</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-01.02</td>
<td>-03.03</td>
<td>-17.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*high score indicates disagreement

NOTE: figures are rounded to two decimal places and decimal points are removed.
I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job" (agree).

Factor II is similar to Factor I. In fact, most of these items combine in Maslach's research to form one subscale. However, Factor II consists of items that relate to the results of the respondent's interactions with clients. Thus, this factor is named Frequency of Emotional Exhaustion and consists of the following items in order of size of factor loading: "I feel like I'm at the end of my rope" (agree); "I feel burned out from my work" (agree); "I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally" (agree); "Working directly with people puts too much stress on me" (agree) and "Working with people all day is really a strain for me" (agree).

The items that load on Factor III are very similar to those on Maslach's Personal Accomplishment subscale and therefore, this factor is named Frequency of Lack of Personal Accomplishment. The three highest loading items in order of size of factor loading are: "I deal very effectively with the problems of my clients" (disagree)" "I have accomplished many worthwhile things on this job" (disagree) and "I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients" (disagree).

Factor IV is named Frequency of Ambivalence Toward Clients because it consists of items relating to the respondent's mixed feelings toward clients. This factor implies that workers feel some guilt when they experience negative feelings toward clients. The three items that load on this factor in order of size of factor loading are: "I feel clients
blame me for some of their problems" (agree); "I don't really care what happens to some clients" (agree) and "I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients" (agree).

Factor V is named Frequency of Callousness because the two items that loaded clearly relate to a worker's feelings of increasing callousness toward clients. The two items in order of size of factor loading are: "I have become more callous toward people since I took this job" (agree) and "I feel I treat some clients as if they were impersonal objects" (agree).

Factor VI is named Frequency of Intense Emotional Involvement because the item that loads most highly, "I feel personally involved with my client's problems" (agree), indicates a high level of emotional involvement. The two additional items that load on this factor, "I feel very energetic" (disagree) and "I feel exhilarated after working closely with my clients" (disagree) also suggest that the intensity of this involvement leaves the worker feeling drained and deadened.

Only one item loads on Factor VII which is named "Frequency of Identification With Clients." This item is "I feel similar to my clients in many ways" (agree).

Similarly, only one item loads on Factor VIII which is named Frequency of Lack of Empathy." This item is "I can easily understand how my clients feel about things" (disagree).

4.1.2.3 M.B.I. intensities items. Table 4.1.2.3 presents the principal components analysis of M.B.I. intensities items. It may be seen that seven factors emerge accounting for 65%
### Table 4.1.2.3

Principal Components Analysis of Intensities Scores (M.B.I.):

Loadings of M.B.I. Intensities Items on Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
<th>Factor VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor #1: Intensity of Tedium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel frustrated by my job</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel burned out from my work</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel like I'm at the end of my rope</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I feel I'm working too hard on my job</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I feel used up at the end of the workday</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor #2: Intensity of Lack of Personal Accomplishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I deal very effectively with the problems of my clients</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I feel exhilarated after working closely with my clients</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor #3: Intensity of Emotional Withdrawal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel I treat some clients as if they were impersonal &quot;objects&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel emotionally drained from my work</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Working with people all day is really a strain for me</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Working directly with people puts too much stress on me</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor #4: Intensity of Callousness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I've become more callous toward people since I took this job</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I don't really care what happens to some clients</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor #5: Intensity of Identification With Clients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel personally involved with my clients problems</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel similar to my clients in many ways</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor #6: Intensity of Feeling Ineffective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I can easily understand how my clients feel about things</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I have accomplished any worthwhile things in this job</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor #7: Intensity of Feeling Culpable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel clients blame me for some of their problems</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO FACTOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*High score indicates disagreement

**NOTE:** figures are rounded to two decimal places and decimal points are removed.
of the variance and that two items load on none of the factors.

Factor I is named Intensity of Tedium because four of the items that load on the Frequency of Tedium factor also load on this intensity factor. These items include: "I feel frustrated by my job" (agree); "I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job" (agree); "I feel used up at the end of the workday" (agree) and "I feel I'm working too hard on my job" (agree).

Factor II is named Intensity of Lack of Personal Accomplishment and contains many of the items contained in the Frequency of Lack of Personal Accomplishment factor. The three items that load highest on the intensity factor also load highest on the frequency factor. These include: "In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly" (disagree); "I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients" (disagree) and "I deal very effectively with the problems of my clients" (disagree).

Factor III is named Intensity of Emotional Withdrawal because items relate to conditions that would lead to a worker withdrawing emotionally from clients. The three highest loading items in order of size of factor loading are: "I feel I treat clients as if they were impersonal objects" (agree); "I feel emotionally drained from my work" (agree) and "Working with people all day is really a strain for me" (agree).

Factor IV is named Intensity of Callousness because the items relate to emotional hardening, callousness and an uncaring attitude. The three items that load on this factor
in order of size of factor loading are: "I've become more callous toward people since I took this job" (agree); "I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally" (agree) and "I don't really care what happens to some clients" (agree).

Factor V is named Intensity of Identification With Clients because the items relate to feelings of being similar to and emotionally involved with clients. The two items in this factor load equally and are: "I feel personally involved with my client's problems" (agree) and "I feel similar to my clients in many ways" (agree).

Factor VI is named Intensity of Feeling Ineffective because the items relate to feelings that one's efforts produce few results. Two items load equally: "I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work" (disagree) and "I can easily understand how my clients feel about things" (disagree). A third item loads at a lower level: "I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job" (disagree).

Factor VII contains only one item, "I feel clients blame me for some of their problems" and this is named Intensity of Feeling Culpable.

4.1.2.4 Correlations of M.B.I. factors. The reader will recall that a number of analyses were conducted in order to determine how the M.B.I. could be reduced to its simplest terms in order to facilitate further analysis. Appendix D represents Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis of Maslach's four subscales and the frequencies M.B.I.
factors, intensities M.B.I. factors and combined frequencies and intensities M.B.I. factors previously discussed.

It can be seen that the 14 combined frequencies and intensities M.B.I. factors presented in Appendix E would result in a very complex and long analysis. In fact, there are too many factors for clear, meaningful analysis. It is impossible to reduce these 14 factors any further because they are, by definition, independent. However, Appendix D demonstrates that, when the seven intensities M.B.I. factors are correlated with the eight frequencies M.B.I. factors, there are a considerable number of significant relationships (i.e. 22 relationships out of a potential 56 are correlated at a significance level of $p < .05$ or higher). For example, frequency of tedium correlates with intensity of tedium at a level of $r = .56$ ($p < .0001$); frequency of lack of personal accomplishment correlates with intensity of lack of personal accomplishment at a level of $r = .46$ ($p < .0001$) and frequency of lack of empathy correlates with intensity of feeling ineffective at a level of $r = .34$ ($p < .0001$).

Thus, the researchers expected that a second order principal components analysis of the intensities M.B.I. and frequencies M.B.I. factors would result in a smaller number of components, thereby facilitating further analysis. The results of this second order analysis are described below.

It should be noted that Appendix D also demonstrates that, as expected, the factors developed from this sample correlate highly with similar subscales developed by Maslach.
For example, the frequency of tedium, intensity of tedium, frequency of emotional exhaustion and intensity of emotional withdrawal factors all correlate significantly with Maslach's emotional exhaustion subscale (p < .001).

4.1.2.5 Second order principal components analysis of M.B.I. frequencies and M.B.I. intensities factors. In order to facilitate analysis by further reducing the number of factors, the M.B.I. frequencies and M.B.I. intensities factors described above were subjected to a second order principal components analysis, the results of which are presented in Table 4.1.2.5. It may be seen that eight factors emerged based on the original fifteen factors and these accounted for 81.5% of the variance.

Second order Factor I (Callousness Toward Clients), Factor II (Identification With Clients), Factor III (Tedium) and Factor IV (Lack of Personal Accomplishment) were all named on the basis that these second order factors are comprised of matching frequency and intensity factors. Since second order Factor VIII consists of only one factor (i.e. Frequency of Emotional Exhaustion), it was named Emotional Exhaustion.

Second order Factor V was named Detachment From Clients because the negative correlation between the two factors comprising second order Factor V indicates that as frequency of intense emotional involvement decreases, intensity of emotional withdrawal increases.

Second order Factor VI was named Ambivalence Toward
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
<th>Factor 7</th>
<th>Factor 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong>: Callousness Toward Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Callousness</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intensity of Callousness</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong>: Identification With Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Identification With Clients</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intensity of Identification With Clients</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong>: Tedium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Tedium</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intensity of Tedium</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong>: Lack of Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Lack of Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intensity of Lack of Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 5</strong>: Detachment From Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Intense Emotional Involvement</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intensity of Emotional Withdrawal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 6</strong>: Ambivalence Toward Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Ambivalence Toward Clients</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intensity of Feeling Culpable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 7</strong>: Worker's Feelings of Ineffectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Lack of Empathy</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Intensity of Feeling Ineffective</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 8</strong>: Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Frequency of Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Figures are rounded to two decimal places and decimal points are removed.
Clients because the factors that loaded in order of factor loading size are "Frequency of Ambivalence toward Clients" and "Intensity of Feeling Culpable." The four items that comprise these two factors are: "I feel clients blame me for some of their problems" (agree, frequency and intensity); "I don't really care what happens to some clients" (agree) and "I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients" (agree). Thus, it appears that workers experience feelings of guilt, responsibility toward clients and anger. These mixed feelings indicate ambivalence toward clients.

Second order Factor VII was named Workers' Feelings of Ineffectiveness because it consists of two factors, listed in order of factor loading size: Frequency of Lack of Empathy and Intensity of Feeling Ineffective. The most basic expectation of a social worker is that he understand and empathize with clients. An inability to do so will result in a worker feeling that he is performing ineffectively.

4.1.2.6 Expectations items. Table 4.1.2.6 presents the principal components analysis performed on expectations items, again to reduce the 27 original items to a more manageable number of factors. It may be seen that ten factors emerged from the 27 items accounting for 67% of the variance. One item loads on none of the factors.

Factor I was named Lack of Worker Self Determination because it relates to conditions that inhibit the worker's control over his overall work situation. Thus, the three highest loading items in order of size of factor loading were:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
<th>Factor VII</th>
<th>Factor VIII</th>
<th>Factor IX</th>
<th>Factor X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 Lack of Worker Self Determination</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Obligation to uphold legal mandate will hamper development of helping</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Court will take up too much time</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Will bother me that cases may blow at any time</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Won't have chance to participate in development of agency policies</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Most clients will be resistant, uncooperative</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Unprepared for intense emotional involvement with clients</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Will bother me that work focuses on suffering of families</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 Lack of External Resources &amp; Support</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Agency will offer ample opportunity for staff development</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Community will provide adequate resources/support</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Will be able to develop good social work skills</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Sufficient opportunities to advance in clinical area</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 Feelings of Professionalism</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Social work will be high status profession</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) As good social worker, I won't dislike clients</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 Workaholism</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I will leave work at office so it won’t interfere with personal life</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-76</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Will be praised for job well done</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-76</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5 Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Will have positive relationship with supervisor</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Will receive support from colleagues</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6 Insufficient Recreational Opportunities</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Will have adequate social/recreational outlets in off hours</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Caseload will be manageable size</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7 Hands-on Responsibility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Responsibility of lives of children on my shoulders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Environment too uncomfortable to accomplish admin tasks or direct service</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 8 Lack of Accountability</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Criteria for success too vague for sense of accomplishment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Won't have to spend excessive amounts of time on routine admin duties</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 9 Propensity to Challenge System</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Easiest way to change policies is to confront system</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Will have to work many hours of overtime</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 10 Unavailability of Work Breaks</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) When pressure becomes too great, will be ample opportunity for timeouts</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*high score indicates disagreement)

NOTE: figures are rounded to two decimal places and decimal points are removed.
"My obligation to uphold the legal mandate of the C.W.A. will hamper the development of a helping relationship with clients" (agree); "Court work will take up too much of my time" (agree) and "It will continually bother me that any of my cases may blow at any minute like a time bomb" (agree). These items preclude the freedom of choice which a worker may have in terms of the manner in which he wishes to deal with his case-load and the amount of time he may spend in doing so. The legal mandate of the C.W.A. precludes any freedom in terms of adhering to reporting laws. Frequently, this leads to court involvement which often is a very time consuming exercise since the worker is at the pleasure of the court. The expectation that a worker continually be available to deal with explosive cases inhibits him from planning and carrying through his work day according to plan.

Factor II was named Lack of External Resources and Support because it relates to conditions that are external to the worker's inner resources and strength but that inhibit workers from developing and practicing professionally. Thus, the items which loaded in order of size of factor loading were: "This agency will provide ample opportunity for staff development" (disagree); "I will be able to practice and develop good social work skills" (disagree); "In keeping with its expectations of CAS workers, the community will provide the necessary resources and supports to achieve the mandate of protecting children" (disagree) and "Sufficient opportunities will exist for me at CAS to advance in the clinical
area" (disagree).

Factor III was named Feelings of Professionalism because it focuses upon feelings which respondents have toward the profession of social work. Thus, the items which loaded in order of size of factor loading were: "I expect social work to be regarded as a high status profession in the community" (disagree) and "As a good social worker I will not dislike any of my clients" (agree). Since these items are negatively correlated they indicate that respondents expect that as the social work profession decreases in status, workers are less compelled to like their clients. Conversely, as the status of the social work profession increases, workers are more compelled to like their clients. As discussed in perception Factor VI, social workers seem to expect the status of the profession to derive from the nobility of its professional values.

Factor IV was named Workaholism because, in light of the fact that the items are negatively correlated, respondents associate increased praise from supervisors and colleagues with an inability to leave work at the office. This indicates an attitude of workaholism (i.e. positive feedback is related to amount of time worked and effort expended). Thus, the items which loaded in order of size of factor loading were: "I will be able to leave my work at the office so that it will not interfere with my personal life" (disagree) and "I will be praised by my supervisors and colleagues for a job well done" (disagree).
Factor V was named Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems because it indicates that respondents feel that as relationships with supervisors became less positive, support from colleagues also decreased. Thus, the items which loaded in order of size of factor loading were: "I shall have a positive constructive relationship of mutual respect with my supervisor" (disagree) and "I expect to receive professional and personal support from my fellow workers in this agency" (disagree). The items comprising this factor are identical to those comprising perceptions Factor V.

Factor VI was named Insufficient Recreational Opportunities because it indicates that respondents feel that as their caseload became less manageable, then social and recreational outlets in off hours became less adequate. The items which loaded in order of size of factor loading were: "I will have adequate social or recreational outlets in my off hours" (disagree) and "My caseload will be of a manageable size" (disagree). It is logical to conclude that as caseload size increases, one is less likely to have sufficient time for recreation and will be less psychologically disposed to enjoy it.

Factor VII was named Hands-On Responsibility because the item, "The responsibility for the lives and well-being of the children on my caseload will be directly on my shoulders" (agree) is the item which loads most heavily. Although the item, "The physical environment here will be too uncomfortable to accomplish either administrative tasks or direct service to
clients" (agree) loads on this factor it is a weak loading. The fact that this item and the No Factor item related to salaries load at levels of .50 and .44 respectively, indicates that social workers feel that physical working conditions and salaries do not adequately compensate for the responsibility that they are expected to assume.

Factor VIII was named Lack of Accountability because it consists of items indicating that success is measured by criteria that are too vague to demand accountability. Thus, the items which loaded in order of size of factor loading were: "The criteria for success in child welfare will be too vague to provide me with a sense of accomplishment" (agree) and "I will not have to spend excessive amounts of time on routine administrative duties" (agree). These items indicate that if criteria for success are too vague to engender a sense of accomplishment, then respondents won't feel a need to spend excessive amounts of time on routine administrative duties. There is no value or reward in being accountable for one's performance.

Factor IX is named Propensity to Challenge System because it consists of items related to the individual worker effecting change in the system. Thus, the items which loaded in order of size of factor loading were: "I will find that the most effective way to change policies and procedures is to take things into my own hands and to confront the system" (agree) and "In order to finish my work I will have to work many hours of overtime" (agree). These items indicate that in order to
effectively make changes in the system one has to take things into their own hands. Much overtime must be worked in order to accomplish this end, while at the same time meeting day to day job responsibilities.

Factor \( X \) is named Unavailability of Work Breaks because it consists of the item "When the pressure becomes too great there will be opportunities for me to be spelled off" (disagree).

4.1.2.7 Perceptions items. Principal components analysis was performed on perceptions items and this analysis is presented in Table 4.1.2.7. It may be seen that 8 factors emerge consisting of twenty three items that account for 60.9\% of the variance. There is one item which loads on more than one factor and three items which load on no factors.

Factor I was named Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service because it relates to external conditions which prevent the worker from carrying out his duties in a manner which is satisfactory and rewarding to him. Thus, the four highest loading items in order of size of factor loading were: "My obligation to uphold the legal mandate of the C.W.A. hampers the development of a helping relationship with clients" (agree), "Most of my clients are uncooperative or resistant" (agree), "My salary is a fair reflection of the quality and quantity of work expected of me" (disagree) and "I am able to practice and develop good social work skills" (disagree).

Factor II was named Lack of Organizational Support to Individual Worker, because it relates to conditions within the organization which are non-supportive of the mental health
### TABLE 4.1.2.7

**PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS SCORES:**
LOADINGS OF PERCEPTIONS ITEMS ON FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
<th>Factor VII</th>
<th>Factor VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1: Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Obligation to uphold legal mandate hampers development of helping relationship</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Most clients are resistant / uncooperative</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Salary is fair reflection of quantity / qualify of work expected</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Able to practice / develop good social work skills</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Caseload manageable</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Physical environment too uncomfortable for admin or direct service tasks</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2: Lack of Organizational Support to Individual Worker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) When pressure too great opportunities exist for work breaks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Opportunity does not exist for participation in policy development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Am praised by colleagues / supervisor for job well done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Ample opportunity exists for staff development</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Sufficient opportunities exist to advance in clinical area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3: Inability to Leave Work at the Office</strong></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Can leave work at office so doesn't interfere with personal life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Adequate social / recreational outlets in off hours</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) In order to finish work, I must work overtime</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Court takes too much time</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4: Emotional Erosion</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Unprepared for intense emotional involvement with clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Court takes too much time</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 5: Lack of Professional &amp; Personal Support Systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Have relationship of mutual respect with supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Receive personal &amp; professional support from colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 6: Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values</strong></td>
<td>08</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) A good social worker must not dislike clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Bothers me that work focuses on pain / suffering of families</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 7: Commitment to Direct Service</strong></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Responsibility for well being of clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Must spend excessive time in administrative work</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-19</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 8: Propensity to Challenge System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Easiest way to change policies is to confront system</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIXED FACTORS: Status of Profession</strong></td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO FACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Bothers me that cases may &quot;blow&quot; at any time (type of cases: explosive)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Criteria for success too vague for sense of accomplishment (lack of tangible results)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Community provides necessary resources &amp; supports to achieve mandate (community support)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*high score indicates disagreement with statement

**NOTE:** figures have been rounded to two decimal places and decimal points removed.
and job performance of workers as individuals. Thus, the three highest loading items in order of size of factor loading were: "When the pressure becomes too great there are opportunities for me to be spelled off" (disagree), "I have no opportunity to directly participate in the development of policies and procedures in this agency" (agree) and "I am praised for a job well done by my supervisors and colleagues" (disagree).

Factor III was named Inability to Leave Work at the Office because it relates to the choice a worker makes between working and either spending time at home or recreating elsewhere. Thus, the three items which loaded on this factor in order of size of factor loading were: "I am able to leave my work at the office so that it does not interfere with my personal life" (disagree), "I have adequate social or recreational outlets in my off hours" (disagree) and "In order to finish my work I must work many hours of overtime" (agree).

Factor IV was named Emotional Erosion because it relates to the concept that the emotions are worn down as a result of the stress of involvement in court. Thus, the items which loaded on this factor in order of size of factor loading were: "My training left me unprepared for the repeated intense emotional involvement with clients that I experience in this setting" (agree) and "Court work takes up too much of my time" (agree). In view of the respondents feeling that court work takes up an excessive amount of time, and that their training left them unprepared for the intensity of the emotional involvement with
clients, it is logical to conclude that their emotional resources would wear down or erode. It should be noted that the no factor item, "It continually bothers me that any of my cases may blow at any minute like a time bomb" (agree), loaded on this factor at a level of .47. This adds to the emotional drain upon the worker in that not only is he continually cognizant of the fact that volatile cases may erupt at any moment, but he is not able to devote sufficient time to these cases because of the inordinate amount of time spent involved in court work.

Factor V was named Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems because it relates to the nature of the relationship of respondents with their supervisors in addition to the unavailability of personal and professional support from colleagues. Thus, the items which loaded on this factor in order of size of factor loading were: "I have a positive constructive relationship of mutual respect with my supervisor" (disagree) and "I receive personal and professional support from my fellow workers in the agency" (disagree).

Factor VI was named Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values because it refers to the professional values of acceptance of and unconditional positive regard for the client, while at the same time addressing the disdainful nature of the work. Thus, the items which loaded on this factor in order of size of factor loading were: "As a good social worker I must not dislike any of my clients" (agree) and "It bothers me that my work here focuses upon the pain and
suffering of children and their families" (agree). It should be noted that the mixed factor item, "Social Work is a high status profession in the community" (disagree) has a weight of -.51 within this factor. This may be interpreted to mean that respondents viewed the status of the profession as deriving from the nobility of the professional values (see Factor III in expectations) and the unpleasantness of the work.

Factor VII was named Commitment to Direct Service because it refers to the responsibility of the respondents to be directly involved with clients in light of the nature of the work they do. Thus, the items which loaded on this factor in order of size of factor loading were: "The responsibility for the lives and well-being of the children on my caseload lies directly on my shoulders" (agree) and "I must spend an excessive amount of time on routine administrative work" (agree). It is logical to conclude from these items that as one feels more responsible for the well-being of his clients, he will feel compelled to spend greater amounts of time with clients in direct service, as opposed to routine administrative duties.

Factor VIII was named Propensity to Challenge System because it refers to the fact that respondents feel that the easiest way to change policies is to personally confront the system. Thus, the item which loaded on this factor was, "I have found that the most effective way to change policies and procedures is to take things into my own hands and confront
the system" (agree).

4.1.2.8 Description of difference scores. As previously mentioned, differences scores were calculated by subtracting the score in the perceptions section from the score for the matching item in the expectations section of the questionnaire. Thus, \( D_1 = E_1 - P_1 \) where \( D \) = difference score, \( P \) = perception score, \( E \) = expectation score and the subscript indicates the item or variable being measured. Since it will be recalled that all items were scored so that the higher the score, the more the burnout, a low difference score indicates that a respondent presently perceives more burnout than he expected. For example, if a value of one (indicating low burnout) is substituted for \( E \) and a value of five (indicating high burnout) is substituted for \( P \) then

\[
D_1 = E_1 - P_1 \\
-4 = 1 - 5
\]

Thus a low score of \(-4\) indicates that a respondent arrived on the job expecting the low burnout condition but then perceives the high burnout condition as prevailing. Conversely, a high difference score of \(+4\) indicates low burnout (i.e. conditions are perceived as better than expected).

4.1.2.9 Principal components analysis of difference scores. Table 4.1.2.9 presents the principal components analysis of difference scores which was performed to reduce the 27 items to a more manageable number. It may be seen that nine factors emerged consisting of a total of 23 items which account for 61.8% of the variance. The remaining four items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
<th>Factor VII</th>
<th>Factor VIII</th>
<th>Factor IX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor I: Organisational Support</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I have positive, constructive relationship of emotional support with supervisor</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I am praised by supervisors, colleagues for job well done</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Agency offers ample opportunity for staff development</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Sufficient opportunities exist to advance in clinical area</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor II: Lack of Professional Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Detractors on work that focuses on pain and suffering of families</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Social work in a high status profession</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Most clients are uncooperative &amp; resistant</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor III: Worker Self Determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) It bothers me that cases may &quot;slip&quot; at any minute</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Obligation to uphold legal mandate hampers development of helping relationship</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I am able to leave work at office on it doesn't interfere with home life</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) To finish work, I must work many hours overtime</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor IV: Opportunity for Professional Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I am able to develop good social work skills</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Cessation is of manageable size</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor V: Facilitative Professional Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Training left me unprepared for intense emotional involvement with clients</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I will not have opportunity to participate in policy development</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Physical environment too uncomfortable to accomplish tasks</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor VI: Obligation to Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I don't spend excessive amount of time on routine administrative duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) As a social worker, I do not dislike clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor VII: Ability to Deal with Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Court work takes up too much time</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor VIII: Accuracy of Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) My salary is fair reflection of quality &amp; quantity</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Responsibility for welfare of families lies directly on my shoulders</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor IX: Worker Self Reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Criteria for success too vague for feeling of accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Most effective way to change policies is to confront system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 60 FACTORS

1) When pressure becomes too great there will be opportunities for timeouts
2) Community will provide necessary resources & supports
3) I have adequate social/relaxation outlets
4) I receive professional & personal support from colleagues

*since a high difference score indicates less burnout, items marked with an asterisk (i.e., those where a high score indicated disagreement in the perceptions and expectations scaled) should be read as they are written (i.e., the respondent agrees with the statement). Conversely, those items without an asterisk (i.e., those where a high score indicated agreement in the perceptions and expectations scaled) should be interpreted negatively (i.e., the respondent disagrees with the statement).

**Note:** Figures have been rounded to two decimal places and decimal points removed.
did not meet the loading criterion for any factor. In describing difference factors, items are presented in the present tense for the sake of clarity. However, the reader must be aware that difference scores suggest a change over time. It should also be remembered that, whereas a high expectation or perception score indicates high burnout, a high difference score indicates low burnout.

Factor I was named Organizational Support because it consists of items related to the availability of support systems within the organization. The three highest loading items, in order of size of factor loading are: "I have a positive constructive relationship of mutual respect with my supervisor" (agree), "I am praised by my supervisor and colleagues for a job well done" (agree) and "This agency offers ample opportunity for staff development" (agree).

Factor II was named Lack of Professional Esteem because it consists of items related to the perception that CAS's are the "last resort" for many multi-problem families and that this affects a worker's sense of professional status. Thus, the items that load on this factor, in order of size of factor loading are: "It bothers me that my work focuses on the pain and suffering of children and their families" (disagree), "Social work is a high status profession" (agree) and "Most clients are uncooperative and resistant" (disagree). The fact that the second item is negatively correlated indicates that as the status of the profession decreases, clients become more cooperative and the work focuses less on pain and suffering.
This indicates that social workers view the profession as low status but that status increases as difficulty of cases increases.

Factor III was named Worker Self Determination because it consists of items that enhance a worker's ability to plan and control casework intervention. The three items that load highest on this factor in order of size of factor loading are: "It bothers me that cases may blow like a time bomb at any minute" (disagree), "The obligation to uphold the legal mandate of the C.W.A. hampers the development of a helping relationship" (disagree) and "I am able to leave my work at the office so that it does not interfere with my home life" (agree).

Factor IV was named Opportunity for Professional Satisfaction because it consists of items that enhance a worker's sense of accomplishment from his professional performance. The two items that load on this factor in order of size of factor loading are: "I am able to develop good social work skills" (agree) and "My caseload is of a manageable size" (agree).

Factor V was named Facilitative Professional Milieu because it relates to conditions outside the worker that enable him to accomplish professional tasks and goals. Thus, the items that load on this factor in order of size of factor loading are: "My training has left me unprepared for the intense emotional involvement with clients that I experience in this setting" (disagree), "I will not have an opportunity
to participate in the development of policies and procedures" (disagree) and "The physical environment here is too uncomfortable to accomplish tasks" (disagree).

Factor VI was named Obligation to Clients because it consists of items related to amount of time spent with clients and one's obligation to regard clients in a positive light. Thus, the two items that load on this factor in order of size of factor loading are: "I don't spend excessive amounts of time on routine administrative duties" (disagree) and "As a good social worker, I must not dislike clients" (disagree). The negative factor scores indicate that respondents agree with both of the above statements so that as they spend more time in direct contact with clients, they feel more compelled to like their clients.

Factor VII was named Ability to Deal With Court because it consists of one item: "Court work takes up too much of my time" (disagree).

Factor VIII was named Adequacy of Compensation because it consists of items dealing with whether salaries are fair remuneration for the responsibility one is expected to assume. Thus, the two items that load on this item, in order of size of factor loading are: "My salary is a fair reflection of the quality and quantity of work expected of me" (agree) and "The responsibility for the welfare of families and children lies directly on my shoulders" (disagree).

Finally, factor IX was named Worker Self Reliance because it consists of items related to developing criteria for success
in casework and effecting change within the system. Thus, the two items that load on this factor in order of size of factor loading are: "The criteria for success in child welfare are too vague to provide me with a feeling of accomplishment" (disagree) and "The most effective way to change policies is to confront the system" (disagree). These items indicate that the worker must rely on his own criteria and designs.

4.2 Major Results

4.2.1 Comparison of Means for Expectations, Perceptions and Difference Items

Since correlation and principal factor analysis indicate the direction of correlations but do not indicate how the sample actually responded, a comparison of the mean responses for all items is presented in Table 4.2.1. Naturally, mean scores, calculated by adding actual scores and dividing by the number of respondents, provide an indication of the average response to each question.

It will be recalled that expectations and perceptions items were coded so that a score of one indicates low burnout, three indicates neutrality and five represents high burnout. It will also be recalled that a positive difference score represents low burnout or exceeded expectations (to a maximum of +4.0), zero indicates no change and a negative difference score indicates high burnout or unmet expectations (to a maximum of -4.0)

The expectations means presented in Table 4.2.1 indicate that respondents were generally in the moderately positive
### Table 4.2.1

**GROUP MEAN RESPONSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable b)</th>
<th>Group Means c) for Expectations Items</th>
<th>Group Means c) for Perceptions Items</th>
<th>Group Means d) for Difference Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizational Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) relationship with supervisor</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) opportunities for positive feedback</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) opportunities for staff development</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) opportunities for clinical advancement</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of Professional Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) nature of work (focus on pain)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) status of profession (involuntary)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) nature of clients</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Worker Self Determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) type of cases (explosive)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) hours of work</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) role conflict (helper vs. investigator)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) separating work and home life</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Opportunity for Professional Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) opportunity to use professional skills</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) caseload size</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Facilitative Professional Milieu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) training preparing one for emotional involvement</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) democratic decision making</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) physical environment</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Obligation to Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) amount of time spent in direct contact with clients</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) professional values</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ability to Deal With Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) court work</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Adequacy of Compensation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) salary level</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) hands-on responsibility</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Worker Self Reliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) lack of tangible results</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) propensity to challenge system</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO FACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) opportunities for work breaks</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) community expectations and support</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) availability of social/recreational outlets</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) availability of professional/personal support</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**

a) all figures are rounded to the nearest two decimal places.

b) items are presented according to principal components delineated from difference scores.

c) the higher the score the more the burnout.

d) the higher the score the less the burnout.
expectation range when they commenced employment. In descending order, they were most optimistic in the areas of professional and personal support ($\bar{x} = 1.95$), relationship with supervisor ($\bar{x} = 2.06$) and opportunity to develop good social work skills ($\bar{x} = 2.08$). Expectations means further indicate that respondents were most pessimistic in the areas of (in descending order): democratic decision making ($\bar{x} = 2.97$), hands on responsibility for the well-being of children and their families ($\bar{x} = 2.96$) and opportunities for work breaks ($\bar{x} = 2.95$).

Having worked at CAS for a period of time, respondents perceived conditions as most positive in the areas of (in descending order) professional values ($\bar{x} = 1.87$), professional and personal support ($\bar{x} = 1.93$) and availability of social and recreational outlets ($\bar{x} = 2.04$). It is encouraging to note that professional and personal support is a condition that workers expected to encounter and that they subsequently perceived themselves as experiencing it on the job.

Conversely, workers perceived conditions as most negative in the areas of (in descending order) community support ($\bar{x} = 4.02$), status of the profession ($\bar{x} = 3.63$), opportunities for staff development ($\bar{x} = 3.57$) and opportunities for clinical advancement ($\bar{x} = 3.53$).

These trends are interesting, but it is necessary to look at difference means to measure a change over time. For example, greater disappointment (i.e. a low expectation score followed by a high perception score) is evident in the areas of oppor-
tunity for clinical advancement (difference $\bar{x} = -1.18$),
community support (difference $\bar{x} = -1.15$) and opportunities
for staff development (difference $\bar{x} = -1.09$). Conversely,
expectations were most highly exceeded in the areas of amount
time spent in direct contact with clients ($\bar{x} = +0.81$),
indicating that workers are able to spend more time than
expected with clients; professional values ($\bar{x} = +0.48$),
indicating that workers feel that they must not necessarily
like clients in order to perform effectively, and hands-on
responsibility ($\bar{x} = +0.37$), indicating that workers do not
feel solely responsible for their caseloads.

It is interesting to note that certain areas that might
be expected to be contentious, are not. For example, atti-
tudes do not change dramatically during the course of employ-
ment in the areas of: the nature of the work (difference
$\bar{x} = +0.02$), court work (difference $\bar{x} = +0.07$) and role
conflict (difference $\bar{x} = -0.07$).

4.2.2 Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (r)
Analyses

4.2.2.2 Second order M.B.I. factors correlated with
expectations, perceptions and differences factors. Pearson
Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Analysis was conducted
to determine the direction and the level of significance of
the relationships between second order M.B.I. factors and all
the expectations, perceptions and difference factors.

Table 4.2.2.2 indicates that the components of burnout
are most highly correlated with perceptions, next most highly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Names</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Callousness Toward Clients</td>
<td>0.03 0.01 0.11 0.12 0.04 0.12 0.14 0.10 0.05 0.14 0.12 0.09 0.12 0.07 0.08 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Identification With Clients</td>
<td>-0.04 -0.08 -0.09 -0.04 -0.21 -0.12 0.14 -0.10 -0.05 0.14 -0.14 -0.03 -0.04 -0.10 -0.03 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04 -0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Tedium</td>
<td>0.07 0.05 0.07 0.08 0.00 0.04 0.05 0.04 0.10 0.01 0.06 0.06 0.01 0.07 0.03 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Lack of Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>0.08 0.04 0.10 0.00 0.09 0.12 0.10 0.03 0.04 0.04 -0.01 -0.00 0.06 0.06 0.01 0.07 0.03 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Detachment From Clients</td>
<td>0.08 0.05 0.08 0.10 0.18 0.03 0.09 0.05 0.11 0.13 0.03 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ambivalence Toward Clients</td>
<td>0.08 0.05 0.08 0.10 0.18 0.03 0.09 0.05 0.11 0.13 0.03 0.08 0.10 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12 0.09 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Worker's Feelings of Ineffectiveness</td>
<td>-0.04 0.15 0.05 0.15 0.00 0.05 0.13 0.03 0.04 0.12 0.02 0.12 0.13 0.14 0.15 0.22 0.15 0.09 0.15 0.22 0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>0.15 -0.05 0.28 0.15 -0.09 0.01 0.21 -0.03 -0.04 0.09 -0.02 0.03 0.28 0.15 -0.09 0.01 0.21 -0.03 -0.04 0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Figures are rounded to the nearest two decimal places and decimal points are removed.

***** p < .0001  **** p < .001  *** p < .005  ** p < .01  * p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table shows correlation coefficients (r) between second-order factors of perceptions, perceptions, and differences in factors.
correlated with differences and least highly correlated with expectations. This conclusion is drawn because not only are there a greater number of significant relationships in the perceptions area, but these relationships are at a higher level of significance. For example, out of 64 correlations in the perceptions area, 17 were correlated at a level of $r = .16$ or greater ($p < .05$). Of these 17, four were correlated at a level of $r = .32$ or greater ($p < .0001$). This is of particular interest to note in that this is a level of significance which is very rarely attained in social science research. The next area of most significance was differences, in which out of 72 correlations, 11 were correlated at a level of $r = .16$ or greater ($p < .05$). Of these 11, five were correlated at a level of $r = .25$ or greater ($p < .005$). Once again, this level of significance is most unusual for research of this type. Expectations in which there were 80 correlations, was least highly correlated with the M.B.I. Of 80 correlations, 10 were correlated at a level of $r = .20$ or greater ($p < .05$). Although not as significant as perceptions and differences this level of significance is most acceptable in the realm of social science research.

4.2.2.3 Second order M.B.I. factors correlated with perceptions factors. The relationships between components of burnout and the perceptions factors will be discussed in the general order of the significance of the relationship between each component of the burnout scale and the 10 perceptions factors, ranging from most significant to least significant.
Specifically, M.B.I. Factor III, Tedium, is correlated at a highly significant level with the following perceptions factors: Factor I, Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service \(r = .32, p < .0001\); Factor II, Lack of Organizational Support to Individual Worker \(r = .37, p < .0001\); and Factor III, Inability to Leave Work at Office \(r = .33, p < .0001\). Thus, as workers feel physically and emotionally spent and frustrated at the end of each workday (Tedium) they perceive their clients as being resistant and uncooperative. They also perceive their obligation to uphold the legal mandate of the Child Welfare Act as hampering the development of helping relationships (Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service). Further, as tedium increases workers perceive themselves as receiving little or no positive feedback from colleagues and supervisors (Lack of Organizational Support to Individual Worker). This increase of tedium also leads workers to perceive themselves as being unable to separate work and home life as indicated by their propensity to work overtime in order to complete their workload (Inability to Leave Work at Office). It should be noted once again that these relationships are extremely significant within the research context and carry much weight.

Increase of Tedium is correlated at a less dramatic but still significant level with perceptions Factor IV, Emotional Erosion \(r = .22, p < .01\). As tedium increases, workers perceive themselves as being unprepared for intense emotional involvement with clients, especially within the context of court (Emotional Erosion).
M.B.I. Factor VI, Ambivalence Toward Clients is the second M.B.I. factor that is correlated at an extraordinarily significant level with the following perceptions factor: Factor I, Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service ($r = .32$, $p < .0001$). It is also inversely but very significantly correlated with Factor V, Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems ($r = -27$, $p < .005$). Thus, as workers feel unconcerned about clients but blamed by them for client's difficulties (Ambivalence Toward Clients), they once again perceive the legal mandate of the Child Welfare Act as hampering the development of a helping relationship with clients who are already resistant to intervention (Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service). Again, this relationship is at a level of significance which is rare in social science research. Feelings of ambivalence toward clients also lead workers to perceive themselves as having increased personal and professional support from supervisors and colleagues (Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems).

M.B.I. Factor I, Callousness Toward Clients, is the third M.B.I. factor that is correlated at a significant but more moderate level with perceptions Factor I, Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service ($r = .22$, $p < .01$) and Factor VIII, Propensity to Challenge System ($r = .21$, $p < .01$). It is significantly and inversely correlated at a lower level with perceptions Factor VI, Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values ($r = -21$, $p < .01$). Thus, as workers feel that since taking their jobs they have become more callous
toward people (Callousness Toward Clients), they once again perceive the Child Welfare Act as an obstacle to the development of a constructive relationship with already uncooperative clients (Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service). As they have become more emotionally hardened and callous, they perceive that the most efficacious way to make a change in policy is to confront the system head-on (Propensity to Challenge System). They also feel less compelled to like clients even though their work focuses upon intense pain and suffering (Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values).

The next M.B.I. factor that correlates most often and most strongly with perceptions items is M.B.I. Factor IV, Lack of Personal Accomplishment. It is moderately correlated with perceptions Factor IV, Emotional Erosion ($r = .25, p < .01$), moderately and inversely correlated with perceptions Factor VI, Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values ($r = -.21, p < .01$) and inversely correlated at a significant but lower level with perceptions Factor VIII, Propensity to Challenge System ($r = -16, p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel ineffectual and non-productive in their work (Lack of Personal Accomplishment), they perceive themselves as wearing down (Emotional Erosion) from an obligation to adhere to professional values which may be unrealistic, (Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values). As a worker receives less of a sense of personal accomplishment from his job, he has less energy to confront the system in an attempt to effect change (Propensity to Challenge System).
M.B.I. Factor VII, Worker's Feelings of Ineffectiveness is the next M.B.I. factor that correlates moderately with perceptions Factor III, Inability to Leave Work at Office ($r = .21, p < .01$) and inversely at a significant but lower level with perceptions Factor IV, Emotional Erosion, ($r = -.17, p < .05$). Thus, as workers become preoccupied with their inability to influence clients (Worker's Feelings of Ineffectiveness), they are less able to separate work and home life. Since they also perceive themselves as more prepared for intense emotional involvement with people (Emotional Erosion), there appears to be an attitude developing that in order to become more effective, they must invest more emotionally.

M.B.I. Factor VIII, Emotional Exhaustion is significantly correlated at a lower level with only two perceptions factors: Factor III, Inability to Leave Work at Office ($r = .16, p < .05$) and Factor IV, Emotional Erosion ($r = .19, p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel that direct contact with clients is stressful (Emotional Exhaustion), they once again find their jobs intruding on their home lives (Inability to Leave Work at Office). They also see themselves as being unprepared for the intense emotional involvement with people that is expected of them (Emotional Erosion) by their employers.

M.B.I. Factor II, Identification With Clients, is significantly and inversely correlated at a low level with perceptions Factor VIII, Propensity to Challenge System ($r = -.16, p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel similar to their clients in a number of ways and personally involved with their problems (Identifica-
tion With Clients), they perceive that direct confrontation is not the easiest way to deal with the system in order to make changes in policy.

Finally, M.B.I. Factor V, Detachment From Clients which refers to treating clients as if they were impersonal "objects" and feeling that working with them is stressful, does not correlate with any of the perceptions factors.

4.2.2.4 Second order M.B.I. factors correlated with difference factors. The relationships between the components of burnout and the difference factors will be discussed in the general order of the significance of the relationships between each of the eight components of the burnout scale and the difference factors, ranging from highest to lowest.

M.B.I. Factor III, Tedium, appears to be the factor that is most highly correlated with differences between workers original expectations and their actual perceptions. For example, there is an extremely highly significant inverse correlation between Tedium and difference Factor IV, Professional Satisfaction ($r = -0.32, p < 0.0001$); a very highly significant inverse correlation between Tedium and difference Factor I, Organizational Support ($r = -0.27, p < 0.005$) and a significant inverse correlation between Tedium and difference Factor III, Worker Self Determination ($r = -0.17, p < 0.05$). Thus, as workers feel more frustrated and drained by their jobs, they are less able to develop good social work skills than they had originally expected, they receive less support than expected from colleagues and they perceive themselves as
having less control over their workload than they had expected when they commenced their jobs.

M.B.I. Factor VI, Ambivalence Toward Clients, is the burnout factor next most highly correlated with difference factors. Ambivalence toward clients is correlated at an extremely significant level with difference Factor I, Organizational Support ($r = .29$, $p < .001$) and significantly and inversely correlated with difference Factor II, Lack of Professional Esteem ($r = -.21$, $p < .01$). Thus, as a worker receives more support than expected from his colleagues and the organization and as he feels that the status of the social work profession is higher than expected, then he is more likely to feel uncaring toward clients while feeling that those same clients blame him for their problems. Thus, it appears that workers who experienced mixed feelings toward clients seek to validate themselves professionally through relationships with colleagues and identification as members of the social work profession.

M.B.I. Factor II, Identification With Clients, is the M.B.I. factor that is next most often and most significantly correlated with difference factors. It is correlated at an extremely significant level with difference Factor VIII, Adequacy of Compensation ($r = .30$, $p < .005$) and significantly correlated with difference Factor VII, Ability to Deal With Court ($r = .19$, $p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel more personally involved with and similar to their clients, they feel that salaries are a more adequate reflection of work expected and
that they are better able to deal with court than they had originally expected. This indicates that workers who more closely identify with clients are more likely to find satisfaction and meaning in their emotional ties to clients than in external rewards. They are also more likely to find court encounters less demanding than originally expected.

M.B.I. Factor VIII, Emotional Exhaustion, shows a very highly significant but inverse correlation with differences Factor VI, Obligation to Clients ($r = -0.25, p < 0.005$). Thus as workers experience increased strain and feelings of futility, they are less likely to spend time with clients or to adhere to professional values such as unconditional positive regard.

M.B.I. Factor I, Callousness Toward Clients, is significantly correlated with only two differences factors: Factor III, Worker Self Determination ($r = 0.17, p < 0.05$) and Factor IV, Professional Satisfaction ($r = -0.24, p < 0.001$). Thus, as workers feel more emotionally hardened toward clients, they experience less of an opportunity to develop good social work skills than originally expected but are in greater control of their workloads. It would seem that workers must begin to depersonalize their clients in an attempt to cope with the stress of dealing with explosive cases while at the same time separating their home and work life.

Finally, M.B.I. Factor VII, Workers Feelings of Ineffectiveness is significantly correlated with difference Factor IV, Professional Satisfaction ($r = 0.16, p < 0.05$). Thus it appears that as conscientious workers find it more difficult to understand clients and to positively influence their lives, they
perceive a greater necessity to develop good social work skills. This is consistent in that complacent workers who feel that they do empathize with clients would perceive themselves as requiring a lesser need to develop additional skills in this setting.

It is interesting to note that M.B.I. Factor IV, Lack of Personal Accomplishment and Factor V, Detachment from Clients, do not correlate significantly with any difference factors.

4.2.2.5 Second order M.B.I. factor correlated with expectations factors. The relationships between the components of burnout and expectations factors will be discussed in the general order of the significance of the relationship between each of the eight components of the burnout scale and the expectations factors.

M.B.I. Factor VIII, Emotional Exhaustion is very significantly correlated with three expectations factors:

Factor III, Feelings of Professionalism ($r = - .28$, $p < .001$),

Factor VII, Hands-on Responsibility ($r = .21$, $p < .01$) and

Factor IV, Workaholism ($r = .19$, $p < .01$). Thus, as workers feel that direct contact with clients is stressful, (Emotional Exhaustion) they are more likely to have expected that they must like their clients (Feelings of Professionalism); that they would assume direct responsibility for the welfare of children (Hands-on Responsibility) and that they would be praised for working long hours (Workaholism).

M.B.I. Factor I, Callousness Toward Clients is next most
frequently and significantly correlated with expectations factors. Callousness toward clients is significantly correlated with expectations Factor V, Lack of Worker Self Determination ($r = .25, p < .01$) and IX, Propensity to Challenge System ($r = .22, p < .01$). Thus, as workers feel that they have hardened emotionally toward clients they were more likely to have expected that they would experience little autonomy in the CAS setting (Lack of Worker Self Determination). As a result, the easiest and best way to effect a change in policy would be to confront the system directly (Propensity to Challenge System).

A number of M.B.I. factors are significantly correlated with only one expectations factor. For example, M.B.I. Factor II, Identification With Clients is moderately and inversely correlated with expectations Factor V, Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems ($r = -.21, p < .01$). Thus, as workers feel similar to and personally involved with the problems of clients they were more likely to have expected that they would receive personal and professional support from colleagues and supervisors (Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems).

Then, M.B.I. Factor III, Tedium, correlates significantly with expectations Factor IX, Propensity to Challenge System ($r = .20, p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel physically and emotionally drained and frustrated at the end of every workday (Tedium), they were more likely to have expected that confrontation would be the most effective way to initiate changes in
policy (Propensity to Challenge System).

Also, M.B.I. Factor VI, Ambivalence Toward Clients, correlates significantly with expectations Factor I, Lack of Worker Self Determination ($r = .20$, $p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel unconcerned about clients and that clients blame them for some of their difficulties (Ambivalence Toward Clients), they were more likely to feel that their work would be hampered by: an unsupportive organization; the legal mandate of the Child Welfare Act and the nature of both the clients and the work (Lack of Worker Self Determination).

M.B.I. Factor VII, Worker's Feelings of Ineffectiveness, is another factor that correlates significantly with only one expectations factor: Factor IV, Workaholism ($r = .19$, $p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel ineffectual (Worker's Feelings of Ineffectiveness) they were more likely to have expected that they would not be able to separate home and work life but that they would receive positive feedback for a job well done (Workaholism).

M.B.I. Factor V, Detachment From Clients, is significantly and inversely correlated with expectations Factor V, Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems ($r = -.18$, $p < .05$). Thus, as workers feel that they are treating their clients as if they were impersonal objects, they were more likely to have expected that they would receive personal and professional support from colleagues and supervisors (Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems). This appears to indicate that as workers withdraw from clients, they in turn seek emotional
support from colleagues.

Finally, M.B.I. Factor IV, Lack of Personal Accomplishment which refers to dealing with clients effectively does not correlate significantly with any of the expectations factors.

4.2.3 Stepwise Discriminant Function Analysis

Respondents were divided into three groups of equal size according to sum scores on the total M.B.I. Then, stepwise discriminant function analysis was performed to determine which of the demographic variables, expectations, perceptions or difference factors best discriminated between the high burnout and low burnout groups. The middle group was ignored in this analysis so that differences between comparison groups would be more pronounced and therefore, more meaningful. The results of the discriminant analysis are presented in Table 4.2.3.

The reader is cautioned that the researchers' decision to label the groups as low, medium and high burnout is not meant to imply that the whole sample was, in fact, burned out. This terminology was chosen because the instrument used, the Maslach Burnout Inventory, is an instrument designed to measure the degree of burnout. There is no way of determining the absence of burnout on the basis of this instrument. The instrument differs from other social psychological instruments in this respect. For example, it may be possible to develop an instrument that would measure a degree of job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction and thereby place each respondent at some
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor or Item</th>
<th>Order of Entrance</th>
<th>Low Burnout</th>
<th>High Burnout</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>P to Enter at Each Step</th>
<th>P to Remove at Step 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Satisfaction (Difference)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>17.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to Leave Work at the Office (Perception)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Erosion (Perception)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per Week Spent in Direct Contact with Clients (Demographic)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (Demographic)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support (Difference)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Worker Self Determination (Expectation)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
1) figures are rounded to the nearest two decimal places
2) a positive difference score indicates exceeded expectations; a negative score, unmet expectations
3) a positive perception or expectation score indicates high burnout
4) for sex, 1 = male and 2 = female

***** $p < .0001$
**** $p < .001$
*** $p < .005$
** $p < .025$
* $p < .05$
point on this continuum.

The fact that Maslach's instrument does not measure the absence of burnout is not considered a major methodological problem in terms of this exploratory research. This limitation does not detract from or minimize the significance of those factors that are significantly correlated with high burnout scores.

All the variables (i.e. demographic items as well as expectations, perceptions and difference factors) were included in the discriminant analysis. The stepwise procedure enabled us first to select which single variable from this whole set best discriminates the high burnout group from the low burnout group. We then proceed to ask whether two variables would discriminate better than one, and if so, to identify which two these are. Then we proceed to ask whether three variables discriminate better than two and if so, which ones. We proceed in this fashion until all variables which aid in discriminating between the two groups according to the criterion that an F value to enter the discriminant function is significant at a level of p < .05 or better.

Thus, Table 4.2.3 indicates that if we had one variable to discriminate between the high and low burnout groups, it would be a difference factor (Professional Satisfaction). If we selected two variables, we would keep the difference factor and add a perception factor (Inability to Leave Work at the Office). If we selected three variables, we would keep the first two and add another perception factor (Emotional Erosion).
Out of all the demographic, expectations, perceptions and differences factors, seven aid in discriminating. The remaining four in order of entrance are: Hours per Week Spent in Direct Contact With Clients (a demographic variable); Sex (another demographic variable); Organizational Support (a difference factor) and Lack of Worker Self Determination (the only expectation factor which discriminates between the high and low burnout groups).

Thus, the profile of a burned out social worker is as follows:

1. He experiences less professional satisfaction than he had originally expected (i.e. he is less able to develop good social work skills and his caseload is unmanageable),

2. He is less able to leave his work at the office (and consequently works a great deal of overtime and lacks recreational outlets),

3. He is unprepared for intense emotional involvement with clients and suffers emotional erosion,

4. He spends fewer hours per week in direct contact with clients than a worker who scores low on the M.B.I.,

5. He is more likely to be male,

6. He receives less organizational support than he had originally expected (i.e. there are fewer opportunities for work breaks, democratic decision making and positive feedback) and

7. He expects to experience minimal self determination in a CAS setting (i.e. he expects the mandate to inhibit the
development of a helping relationship and expects court to take up too much time).

The profile is self explanatory except for the demographic variables (i.e. time spent in administrative tasks and sex). It may be that burned out CAS workers attempt to avoid contact with clients (to avoid emotional involvement) or that they become overburdened with administrative tasks, thereby spending less time in direct contact with clients. The fact that the high burnout group consists of a greater proportion of males may indicate that males more readily develop callousness toward clients, more readily identify with clients and experience their work as more tedious, since these are the principal components of burnout.

4.2.4 Summary

An analysis of the instruments used in the study preceded the presentation of the major results in an attempt to reduce and simplify the data collected to a more manageable level.

Since it was found that Maslach's four subscales of Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, Personal Achievement and Personal Involvement did not apply to this data, principal components analyses were conducted separately on the M.B.I. frequencies and intensities items, followed by a second order principal components analysis on the resulting M.B.I. frequencies and intensities factors. This analysis resulted in the identification of eight major components of burnout, as measured by the M.B.I.:

1. Callousness Toward Clients
2. Identification With Clients
3. Tedium
4. Lack of Personal Accomplishment
5. Detachment From Clients
6. Ambivalence Toward Clients
7. Workers Feelings of Ineffectiveness
8. Emotional Exhaustion

Principal components analysis was also performed on the expectations, perceptions and differences scales in an attempt to reduce the twenty-seven items on each of these scales to a more manageable number. Ten components were identified from the expectations scale and only one item did not load on any of these factors.

The ten expectations components were:
1. Lack of Worker Self Determination
2. Lack of External Resources and Support
3. Feelings of Professionalism
4. Workaholism
5. Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems
6. Insufficient Recreational Opportunities
7. Hands-on Responsibility
8. Lack of Accountability
9. Propensity to Challenge the System
10. Unavailability of Work Breaks.

Similarly, eight components were identified from the perceptions scale although one item loaded on two factors and three items loaded on none. The eight components were:
1. Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service
2. Lack of Organizational Support to the Individual Worker
3. Inability to Leave Work at the Office
4. Emotional Erosion
5. Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems
6. Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values
7. Commitment to Direct Service
8. Propensity to Challenge System.

It is interesting to note that extensive similarities among the factors derived from the two scales are not evident.

Finally, nine principal components were identified from the difference scores, although four items loaded on none of the factors. These nine components were:

1. Organizational Support
2. Lack of Professional Esteem
3. Worker Self Determination
4. Professional Satisfaction
5. Facilitative Professional Milieu
6. Obligation to Clients
7. Ability to Deal With Court
8. Adequacy of Compensation
9. Worker Self Reliance

When the analysis of instruments was completed, mean expectation, perception and difference scores were compared to find the areas of highest unmet and exceeded expectations.
Expectations were most highly exceeded in the areas of amount of time spent with clients, professional values and hands-on responsibility and were most significantly unmet in the areas of opportunity for clinical advancement, community support and opportunities for staff development. Respondents appeared relatively unconcerned about the issues of the nature of the work, court work and role conflict.

Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient Analyses were then performed to determine how the eight M.B.I. components related to expectations, perceptions and difference factors. It was found that the M.B.I. was most highly correlated with perceptions, next most highly correlated with differences and least highly correlated with expectations. In fact, many of the correlations between M.B.I. factors and perceptions and difference factors were at levels of significance rare in the field of social science research. Specifically, M.B.I. Factor III, Tedium, is correlated at an extremely significant level with the following perceptions factors: I, Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service; II, Lack of Organizational Support; III, Inability to Leave Work at the Office. Tedium is negatively correlated with difference Factor I, Organizational Support. M.B.I. Factor IV, Ambivalence Toward Clients is very significantly correlated with perception Factor I, Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service and negatively correlated with perception Factor V, Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems. Finally, M.B.I. Factor II, Identification With Clients, is extremely significantly correlated
with difference Factor VI, Adequacy of Salary and M.B.I. Factor VIII, Emotional Exhaustion is very highly but inversely correlated with expectations Factor III, Feelings of Professionalism.

The final statistical test used was a stepwise discriminant function analysis to determine which of all the demographic variables as well as the expectation, perception and difference factors best discriminated between a group of respondents with high scores on the M.B.I. and a group of respondents with low scores on the M.B.I. It was found that the following seven variables best discriminated between the two groups:

1. Professional Satisfaction (difference factor)
2. Inability to Leave Work at the Office (perception factor)
3. Emotional Erosion (perception factor)
4. Hours per Week Spent in Direct Contact With Clients (demographic variable)
5. Sex (demographic variable)
6. Organizational Support (difference factor)
7. Lack of Worker Self Determination (expectation factor).
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter will be to highlight the most significant findings and to discuss the research questions in light of the literature survey and the analysis of data. Thus, similarities and differences between the literature and these research findings will be discussed in the following areas:

1. Are unmet job expectations related to burnout?
2. What factors are most significantly correlated with burnout among selected Ontario CAS workers?
3. What is the profile of a burned out CAS worker?

Before addressing the research questions, however, general trends relating to the M.B.I., expectations, perceptions and differences factors will be identified and discussed.

5.1 The Components of Burnout

Maslach (unpublished report) verified the validity and reliability of the 25 items contained in the M.B.I. in terms of measuring burnout. However, the data presented in Table 4.1.1 indicate that, for this sample, the four subscales identified by Maslach do not adequately define the principal components of burnout because these four subscales are not independent. The principal components analyses performed on this data (and presented in Table 4.1.2.5) demon-
strate that, for this sample, burnout consists of eight separate and sharply identified components.

There is ample literature to confirm the importance of each of these eight factors in describing burnout. This is to be expected since Maslach developed the items on her scale on the basis of recurring themes in the literature on burnout (Maslach, unpublished report). For example, Callousness Toward Clients and Identification With Clients have been identified as the first two principal components of burnout.

Callousness refers to feelings of becoming emotionally hardened, treating clients like objects and developing uncaring attitudes toward clients while identification with clients refers to feeling similar to and personally involved with clients.

Studies have been cited that support the concept of callousness as being central to burnout. For example, Maslach and Pines (1977) described burnout as a process which "produces a decreased awareness of the human attributes of others and a loss of humanity in interpersonal interactions." Maslach (1978b), Resener (1979), Pines and Solomon (1977) and Sourkes (1979) confirm that the process of dehumanization and loss of sympathy or respect for clients is integral to burnout. The Berkeley Planning Associates (1977) also list stereotyping clients, and blaming them for their own problems as symptomatic of burnout.

The concept of identification with clients has not been dealt with extensively in the literature. However, it is
reasonable to assume that as one becomes less able to separate home life from work (Daley, 1979; Pines and Kafry, 1978; Freudengerger, 1977a&b and Maslach, 1976) and as one begins to feel more alienated from his original purpose and from the agency (the Berkeley Planning Associates, 1977) then he will seek validation by overidentifying and becoming increasingly emotionally involved with clients.

Tedium, Ambivalence Toward Clients and Callousness are the three components of burnout that are most strikingly related to items delineated in this study. This conclusion is based on the fact that these components are related to more factors and at a higher level than the other components of burnout. These actual relationships will be discussed in later sections. Tedium is comprised of concepts such as feeling frustrated, used up, fatigued and feeling that one is working too hard (the Berkeley Planning Associates, 1977 and Sourkes, 1979) while ambivalence toward clients is comprised of concepts such as feeling that the client blames the worker for his problems, feelings of not caring about clients and feeling uncomfortable about how the worker has treated some clients (the Berkeley Planning Associates, 1977; Sourkes, 1979; Maslach and Pines, 1977; Koriat et. al., 1972).

Although callousness toward and identification with clients are the two primary components of burnout and tedium and ambivalence toward clients are the components of burnout that correlate most highly with the variables measured in this study, other components of burnout are strongly and
interestingly related to certain variables. For example, Emotional Exhaustion correlated most highly with the expectations items and at a very high level with one difference item, Obligation to Clients.

The interested reader may peruse the relationships presented in Table 4.2.2.2 more carefully but to discuss the less significant correlations in greater detail would serve only to detract from the factors to be highlighted.

5.2 The Components of Expectations, Perceptions and Differences

Overall, factors dealing with a lack of organizational, professional and personal support are most strongly and frequently related to burnout components. These factors refer to having a poor relationship with one's supervisor, receiving little support from one's colleagues, and having few opportunities for work breaks, staff development, clinical advancement or participation in policy development. This confirms the assertions of Kadushin (1974), Vroom (1974), and Cohn et al. (1977) that a positive relationship of mutual respect and support with one's supervisor will enhance a worker's ability to cope with stress on the job. Similarly, this data validates the writings of Maslach (1976), Kahn (1978) and Daley (1979) in that if direct service workers are not provided with sanctioned time outs (in the form of coffee breaks, vacations or handling less stressful cases), then these workers will take time outs in more dysfunctional ways (eg. cancelling or missing appointments or procrastinating).

Warnath and Shelton (1976), Daley (1979), Sullivan (1979)
and Maslach (1976) are only a few of the authors that emphasize the need for ongoing staff development for at least two reasons. Workers who feel that they have experienced every possible situation become complacent by repressing their feelings of stress and must be helped to maintain some dynamism. Conversely, workers who lack confidence in their skills will become overwhelmed by the uncertainty they face in dealing with problems.

Vroom (1964), Price (1977), Daley (1976), French (1973), Pines and Maslach (1980) and Sourkes (1979) are among those authors who advocate the necessity of allowing direct service workers an opportunity to participate in the development of policies and procedures within the agency. This provides the worker with a sense that the organization is supportive and that he can exercise some control or influence within the workplace. Obviously, this mitigates against the process of estrangement that many burning out workers experience.

Finally, Kadushin (1974) and Daley (1979) have discussed the importance of providing opportunities for workers to advance in the clinical area. Traditionally, in the field of social services, direct service workers have been obliged to pursue increased status and remuneration in the area of administration rather than in providing an alternative, both in terms of maintaining a high level of experienced workers in the field and in terms of allowing people to fulfill themselves through the continued use and development of current skills is clear.
Emotional Erosion, Milieu. Inhibiting Provision of Service and Inability to Leave Work at the Office are three additional areas that experience recurring high correlations with burnout.

Emotional erosion involves the concepts of lack of preparedness for intense emotional involvement and feeling that court takes up too much time. Kadushin (1974), Daley (1976), Freudenberger (1977a), Mattingly (1977a & b) and Sullivan (1979) all address the issue of the helping professions (and particularly protective services) demanding intense emotional involvement with people in pain and the wearing down effects that this might have on the worker. Kadushin (1979), and Daley (1979) suggest that court involvement provides a focus for this emotional involvement because it highlights the role conflict experienced by the worker (i.e. enforcer versus helper).

Milieu inhibiting provision of service is the factor that includes concepts such as the aforementioned role conflict, the prevalence of resistant clients, unmanageable caseloads, an uncomfortable physical environment, inadequate salaries and an inability to develop casework skills. Kahn (1973), Sullivan (1979) and Cohen (1978) are among those authors who comment on the fact that information overload and high caseloads often inhibit the development of skills. Kadushin (1974), Kahn et. al. (1964), Daley (1979) and Katz and Kahn (1966, 1973, 1978) discuss the conflict that workers experience between their role as helpers and their role as enforcers of
the legal mandate as being one of the stressors that is peculiar to the position of protective services worker.

Daley (1979) and Horejsi and Walz (1979) describe the negative impact that the dreary physical environment in some social service agencies may have on the attitudes of the workers and of the clients who come there to receive help.

Inability to leave work at the office is the factor that refers to an inability to separate one's home life and work, a lack of availability of social or recreational outlets and a need to work many hours of overtime in order to accomplish all required tasks. It is Freudenberg (1974) who describes this phenomenon best when he states that burned out workers have a tendency to spend more and more time at work and to expend more and more energy while accomplishing less and less. Maslach (1976) and Mattingly (1977b) support the notion that as burnout becomes more severe, the separation between one's work and one's private life deteriorates. Even if a worker is able to spend time at home, he is preoccupied with work or is actually performing job functions at home (such as recording).

While it is impossible to determine causation from correlation analysis and it is therefore impossible to determine whether the variables measured lead to burnout or vice versa, it is evident that, if the conditions described are adjusted in some way, then the level of burnout reported will likewise change. It is from this perspective that the findings become meaningful and from which recommendations will be developed.
5.3 Are Unmet Job Expectations Related to Burnout?

The data presented in this study indicates that the first research question can be answered in the affirmative: there is a definite relationship between certain unmet job expectations and specific components of burnout. However, the data presented in Table 4.2.2.2 also demonstrates that workers' current perceptions of their situation far overrides both original expectations or unmet expectations as an indicator of burnout. The significance of perceptions as they relate to burnout will be discussed later in this chapter when the second research question is addressed.

As previously stated the data clearly shows that certain differences are significantly correlated to specific components of burnout demonstrating that cognitive dissonance does play a role in the development of burnout.

Unmet expectations in the area of Professional Satisfaction are most strongly and most frequently correlated with burnout items. These items correlate at an extremely significant level with Tedium and a significant level with Callousness Toward Clients and Workers Feelings of Ineffectiveness. As presented in Table 4.1.2.9, professional satisfaction encompasses the extent to which workers are able to develop good social work skills while at the same time comfortably managing the caseloads which are assigned to them. The necessity of workers being afforded the opportunity to develop their professional skills is addressed throughout the literature on burnout by a number of authors. Maslach (1976) illustrates
the need for such training given the nature of the work when she states,

I believe that their occupations require them to operate in situations of unique stress, for which their previous life experiences have not adequately prepared them. Any of us, facing such a stressful set of circumstances, would probably burn out fairly quickly, but we expect these professionals not to do so. Such an expectation, however, is unwarranted unless they have careful training.

With respect to the manageability of the caseloads which are assigned to workers she states,

Burnout often becomes inevitable when the professional is forced to provide care for too many people. As the ratio increases, the result is higher and higher emotional overload until, like a wire that has too much electricity flowing through it, the worker just burns out and emotionally disconnects. (Maslach 1976)

Thus, workers whose caseloads are larger than they had originally expected and who receive less of an opportunity to develop casework skills have the greatest propensity to burnout.

The differences item which next most strongly and frequently relates to the burnout items is Organizational Support in that it correlates at a very significant level with Tedium and at a significant level with Ambivalence Toward Clients. This item includes whether or not a worker enjoys a positive relationship of mutual respect with his supervisor and whether or not he receives supervisory and peer approbation for work well done while simultaneously being afforded the opportunity to advance in the clinical area should he choose to do so. The advantages of a positive and constructive relationship between workers and the respective supervisors appears repeatedly throughout the literature. Daley (1979) describes the nature
of such a relationship at length and sums up the advantages with respect to burnout when he states,

If workers become emotionally detached from their job, the commitment needed to remediate job-related stress may no longer be forthcoming from them. It is important for both workers and supervisors to identify sources of stress that may lead to burnout and together commit their energies to the efficient management of such factors.

In addition to receiving on-going support from one's supervisor in terms of stress management, it is also necessary for a worker to be able to validate himself professionally. This validation is achieved by an honest self appraisal of one's work and also by means of the feedback one receives from supervisors and colleagues alike. The importance of such feedback is outlined by a number of authors including Freudenberg (1977a), who makes the comment that acknowledge-ment of the efforts of one another, "can go a long way toward diminishing personal disenchantment." Copan et. al. (1979) make an interesting observation with respect to the asking for or giving of professional support by indicating that frequently workers are afraid of "breaking down" in front of colleagues and/or are reluctant to admit and deal with "weakness in self or others." Opportunities for clinical advance-ment seem almost negligible compared to those available to a worker if he wishes to advance within the administrative hierarchy. Obviously there exist a number of workers who are ambitious and wish to advance professionally but at the same time are not at all interested in administration. Rather, these people exhibit a need to achieve in the clinical area
and the desire to advance within this area. Unfortunately, their ambitions are frequently thwarted. Daley (1979) makes a number of suggestions to administrators with respect to decreasing the likelihood of burnout among their workers, one of which is "developing career ladders in direct service." Thus, workers who do not enjoy relationships of mutual respect and support with colleagues and supervisors and who have no opportunity to advance in the clinical area have the greatest proclivity to burnout.

The next differences item which relates as strongly but not as frequently to the burnout items is, Adequacy of Compensation which correlates at a very significant level with Identification With Clients. This item signifies whether or not a worker is of the opinion that his salary is a fair reflection of the quantity and quality of work expected of him and the extent to which he feels that the responsibility for the welfare of families lies directly on his shoulders.

The individual worker's feelings or assumptions that direct responsibility for the lives of children does not lie on their shoulders contradicts the observation of Copans et. al. (1979) that in the group of workers they observed "workers frequently described feeling that they were totally responsible for the families assigned to them." However, this data supports Copans et. al's observations that workers did not hesitate to assume this responsibility. The amount of responsibility which a worker is both able and willing to assume is an individual and a subjective matter; "too much
responsibility may be more than a person can bear easily, whereas too little responsibility may mean that he has a low level, uninteresting job." (French, 1973). This data indicates that burned out workers, who identify too strongly with their clients are less likely to be concerned about salary levels and are less likely to be aware that the responsibility they have assumed is too great. The notion that people are simply unaware of their responsibilities rather than being able to share the burden is supported by the findings that workers perceive support as lacking on the job.

Unmet expectations in the area of obligation to clients correlates at a very significant level with Emotional Exhaustion. This item signifies whether or not a worker is of the opinion that he spends a disproportionate amount of time on routine administrative duties and whether or not he must like his clients in order to be a good social worker.

Bandoli (1977) makes the point that "social service personnel desire to participate with as little bureaucratic red tape as possible in events that influence their lives." The dissonance which results from the necessity to engage in administrative tasks when the worker would much rather be involved in direct client contact is best illustrated by Daley, "the limited time for direct client contact creates a gap between the idealized concept of the caseworker's role and what occurs in practice," i.e. that which the worker originally expected as opposed to what he perceives as occurring in reality. With respect to whether or not a worker feels that
he must like his clients, the values of the profession espouse that workers set aside personal feelings in accordance with nonjudgmental attitudes while at the same time encouraging clients to be self-determining. However, this represents the ideal. In reality, conflict does arise and in view of the legal mandate, workers are obliged not only to make judgments but frequently to prevent clients from being self-determining in the way in which they treat their children. Thus, the data indicates that an emotionally exhausted worker feels compelled to spend an excessive amount of time on administrative tasks and that he no longer has the energy to adhere to professional values such as acceptance and nonjudgmentality.

As previously indicated within this chapter, differences scores seek to measure a change which occurs over time i.e. the difference between that which a worker expected to initially experience when he commenced employment and that which he perceives himself to be experiencing at the present. The average differences scores presented in Table 4.2.1, are arrived at by calculating the mean score for each item. One of the areas of greatest disappointment was opportunity for clinical advancement. This is consistent with the previously discussed significant correlation between Organizational Support and the burnout item Tedium. Another area of great disappointment was Opportunities for Staff Development. This item is also consistent with the previously discussed correlation between Professional Satisfaction and the burnout item Tedium. Expectations were most highly exceeded in the area of amount
of time spent in direct contact with clients, professional values and hands-on responsibility for clients indicating that, as previously discussed, workers tend to spend less time than expected in routine administrative duties, that they do not feel as compelled to adhere to unrealistic professional values and that they are less likely to feel that the responsibility for children lies directly on their shoulders.

5.4 Factors Most Highly Related to Burnout

As previously mentioned, perceptions factors were most frequently and significantly correlated with the components of burnout, followed by differences factors and finally by expectations factors, which were least significantly correlated (see Table 4.2.2.2). Thus, in response to the second research question, it is obvious that a worker's current perceptions are the most significant determinant of burnout; more significant than his unmet expectations and much more significant than his original expectations upon commencing employment. It is possible that the research methodology biased the results because respondents were required to recall original expectations which are inevitably altered by subsequent perceptions. However, the phenomenally significant correlations between perceptions and differences factors and burnout components attests to the validity of the results.

These results confirm the position taken in the literature review chapter that burnout is primarily a function of the worker's subjective experience of his present condition rather than being a function of the objective reality to which
one is exposed. This is consistent with the approach to studying occupational stress described by McLean (1974) in which objective environment is discriminated from individual response and subjective environment. The results also appear to validate the Berkeley Planning Associates (1977) definition of burnout that has been adopted by these researchers—"the degree to which a worker expresses estrangement from clients, co-workers and the agency"—in that estrangement is a subjective perception based on individual predispositions. Freudenberger (1977b) best described the predispositions when he wrote that individuals fail to see their situation as stemming from inside themselves by finding fault with everything around them. It is possible to identify those specific perceptions, differences and expectations factors that are most significantly related to burnout. The discussion of these is presented below.

5.4.1 Perceptions Factors

As seen in Table 4.2.2.2, all components of burnout except Detachment From Clients correlate at a significant level with certain perceptions factors. Since Detachment From Clients does not correlate with either perceptions or differences factors and correlates at a relatively low level of significance with expectations factors, it appears that detachment or withdrawal from clients is not a primary component of burnout for this sample in spite of findings to the contrary by the Berkeley Planning Associates (1977), Shinn (1979), Maslach (1976, 1979a&b), Emener (1979) and Lamb (1979).
As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, Tedium and Ambivalence Toward Clients are the components of burnout most highly correlated with perceptions. These results support the findings of the Berkeley Planning Associates (1979), Sourkes (1979), Lamb (1979) and Freudenberger (1974, 1977a&b) among others, that the symptoms of burnout include irritability, frustration, emotional exhaustion, boredom, resistance to going to work each day and appearing to work harder while accomplishing less. Emener (1979) and Maslach (1978b) also verify that burned out workers perceive clients as blaming workers for their problems and perceive themselves as caring less about their clients.

But what specific perceptions factors are most significantly correlated with burnout? Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service is the perceptions factor most highly correlated with burnout in that it correlates with both Tedium and Ambivalence Toward Clients at incredibly significant levels and with Callousness Toward Clients at a very significant level. As previously discussed, this factor includes the items: role conflict, uncooperative or resistant clients, inadequate salary, opportunity to develop and use good social work skills, unmanageable caseloads and uncomfortable physical working environment.

Thus, it is most interesting to note that although burnout is a subjective experience, workers perceive factors outside themselves and beyond their immediate control as being the primary determinants of burnout. This again relates to
Freudengerber's (1977b) suggestion that workers who look beyond themselves are seeking the answers in the wrong place. The fact that those workers who are oriented toward seeking fulfillment and support in their milieu are, in fact, most burned out reaffirms that their quest has not produced the desired results for themselves.

Similarly, Lack of Organizational Support to the Individual Worker is extremely significantly correlated with Tedium while Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems correlates extremely significantly with Ambivalence Toward Clients. It will be recalled that Lack of Organizational Support includes the items: opportunities for timeouts, opportunities for democratic decision making, opportunities for positive feedback, opportunities for staff development and opportunities for clinical advancement. Again, those workers who are most burned out perceive factors outside themselves as leading to burnout. However, this factor clearly relates to organizational variables and opportunities and to the lack of support that the worker perceives from the organization within which he works.

This reminds us that although burnout is a subjective experience, the perceptions of the individual cannot be ignored. If administrators minimize the importance of these perceptions and fail to take steps to alter them, then many competent workers will be needlessly lost. While this research does not confirm Maslach's (1978a) claim that "the source of the (burnout) problem lies more in the situation than in the
people," the fact that workers perceive the sources of burnout as lying outside themselves supports her contention that "the problem is best understood and modified in terms of the social and situational sources of the job-related stresses."

Lack of Professional and Personal Support Systems refers to two items: relationship with supervisor and availability of support groups. The recurring theme of the need for external supports is again evident. However, there exists a curious relationship indicating that as the availability of support systems increase, ambivalence toward clients increases. This suggests that the direct service worker who begins to care less about clients and to invest less time and energy in direct contact with them as described by Daley (1976, 1979), Pines and Kafry (1978) and Bandoli (1977), also begins to align himself more closely with colleagues and to seek support and meaning in contacts with these colleagues.

Inability to Leave Work at the Office is the final perceptions factor that correlates at a very significant level with Tedium and at significant levels with Workers Feelings of Ineffectiveness and Emotional Exhaustion. This factor consists of the following items: inability to separate work and home life, unavailability of social outlets outside work and propensity to work overtime. This clearly demonstrates the burned out worker's perception that he is so consumed by the stress of the job that the job intrudes into all areas of his life. This is the most significant perceptions correlation that reflects on a worker's ability or inability to draw upon
his inner resources. This may, in fact, be one of the most devastating correlates of burnout because of the far-reaching impact on one's mental and physical health and on one's marriage and family. Maslach (1976 and 1978b), Mattingly (1977b), Daley (1979a), Resener (1979), Freudenberger (1977a) all discuss the stress created within families where work continually intrudes or where spouses grow distant because one decides that he or she must not discuss work at home (in a futile attempt to separate the two). In fact, Kadushin (1974) describes the "interpenetration" of work and home life as a major problem in child welfare. Separation and divorce may ultimately result.

Emotional Erosion is significantly correlated (but at relatively low levels) with four burnout components: Tedium, Lack of Personal Accomplishment, Workers Feelings of Ineffectiveness and Emotional Exhaustion. As previously mentioned, emotional erosion consists of two items: lack of preparedness for emotional involvement and court work taking up too much time. These correlations will have obvious implications for the training of social workers. At the same time the frustration with court may result from the relatively low status that the social worker has within the legal system and the stress of testifying against a family that the worker has attempted to help.

Similarly, Propensity to Challenge the System is correlated at a significant but lower level with Callousness Toward Clients, Lack of Personal Accomplishment and Identification
With clients; dissonance between personal feelings and professional values is correlated with callousness toward clients and lack of personal accomplishment.

Interestingly, commitment to direct service does not correlate with any burnout component. This is contrary to suggestions by Daley (1976 and 1979), Cohen et al. (1977) and Pines and Kafry (1978) that there is a correlation between burnout and the amount of time spent in direct contact with clients and contrary to the writings of Kadushin (1974), Copans et al. (1979) and Kahn (1978) which indicate that workers are likely to experience intense stress if they perceive the responsibility for the well-being of clients as falling squarely on the shoulders of the worker.

It is also interesting to recall that, according to perceptions means presented in Table 4.2.1, respondents perceived conditions as most favorable in the areas of professional values, professional and personal support and availability of social and recreational outlets. This indicates that generally, the sample did not feel compelled to adopt unrealistic professional values (as discussed by Kadushin, 1974 and Watson, 1979) such as unconditional positive regard and thereby avoided placing additional stress on themselves as they attempted to achieve unattainable goals. At the same time, it demonstrates that respondents generally felt that they receive professional and personal support and that they enjoy adequate social and recreational outlets. The fact that these last two items are such powerful correlates of
burnout in spite of the generally positive responses of the sample, emphasizes the importance of the concepts.

Conversely, workers perceived conditions as most unfavorable in the areas of community support and status of the profession. The former item did not load on any of the perceptions factors and the latter loaded on two perceptions factors. Thus, they have not yet been discussed. As discussed in the literature review, Kadushin (1974), Daley (1979) and Pines and Kafry (1978) are among the authors who describe the social services worker (and particularly the protective services worker) as receiving inadequate resources and support from the community to perform his expected function. The source of stress is obvious if workers perceive the community as actually hindering performance by demanding quality performance while providing inadequate resources to ensure the high standards expected. Similarly, Kadushin (1974) describes student social worker's expectations regarding the status of the profession (that is, that it should be high), as inconsistent with the community's perception that social work is high status compared with all occupations but low status when compared with other professions.

Opportunities for staff development and clinical advancement are two additional areas that were perceived unfavorably by respondents but these have been discussed in some detail earlier as strong correlates with burnout.
5.4.2 Differences Factors

The differences factors that correlate most highly with burnout have been discussed in great detail in the discussion of the first research question (see Chapter 5.3). The reader should remember that Professional Satisfaction correlated at extremely significant levels with Tedium and significantly with Callousness Toward Clients and Workers Feelings of Ineffectiveness. Similarly, Organizational Support correlated at very significant levels with Tedium and Ambivalence Toward Clients. Adequacy of Compensation also correlated very significantly with Identification With Clients as did Obligation to Clients with Emotional Exhaustion.

5.4.3 Expectations Factors

Expectations factors correlated least significantly with burnout, indicating that workers arrive on the job with fairly realistic expectations and perhaps indicating that job preparedness is not a crucial issue in child welfare. However, as indicated in Table 4.2.2.2, there is one highly significant correlation and a number of less significant but interesting correlations.

Feelings of Professionalism is the one expectations factor that correlates at a very significant level but negatively with burnout (specifically the Emotional Exhaustion component of burnout). Feelings of professionalism refers to the feelings of respondents that they expect social work to be a low status profession and that they do not expect to adhere closely to professional values such as unconditional positive
regard. The negative correlation between the two factors indicates that workers expect that the status of the profession will be related to the worker's obligation or ability to adhere to professional values and that as workers feel more obligated in this area, they are more likely to experience emotional exhaustion. The deleterious effects of attempting to adhere to unrealistic or misunderstood professional values has already been discussed in some detail (see Chapter 5.3).

The results further indicate that those workers who expected to work long hours and to assume direct responsibility for the well-being of children were also more likely to suffer from emotional exhaustion. It is interesting to note that whereas current perceptions regarding factors external to the worker (such as support systems) are most highly related to burnout, it is the workers who have higher original expectations of themselves (in terms of adhering to professional values and assuming responsibility) that are more likely to burnout. Thus, while current perceptions are clearly more potent indicators of burnout, it can be seen that burned out workers shift their attention from an initial inward focus on personal strengths to an external focus on the weaknesses of the system. This contradicts Kadushin's (1974) comment that beginning social workers express more discontent with policies and administration. These results may be interpreted as meaning that workers simply shift the blame for burnout from personal inadequacies to an impersonal system.

However accurate this interpretation may be, it does not
minimize the fact that people respond to their perceptions and that perceptions should be the focus of intervention. Thus, agency administrators should be aware that applicants who expect to assume direct responsibility for cases or who expect to adhere closely to professional values are at risk to burnout.

Another expectations factor that is significantly correlated with burnout factors is Callousness Toward Clients which is correlated with Lack of Worker Self Determination and with Propensity to Challenge the System. This suggests that workers who expected to confront the system and to experience less autonomy eventually became emotionally hardened toward their clients. Workers who invest a great deal of energy dealing with organizational issues have little left to invest in clients. This notion is contrary to the assertion of Kadushin (1974) that social work students are not terribly concerned about autonomy and independence.

Mean expectations scores indicate that respondents were generally most optimistic in the areas of availability of professional and personal support, experiencing a positive relationship with supervisor and opportunities to develop good social work skills. Since expectations were highest in these areas, it is not surprising that the most burned out workers were those who later perceived these conditions as not existing. Conversely, respondents expected to encounter fewer opportunities for democratic decision making, greater personal responsibility for clients and fewer opportunities
for work breaks.

5.5 The Profile of a Burned Out Social Worker

The results presented in Table 4.2.3 indicate that seven factors best discriminated between the group of respondents with high burnout scores and the group with low burnout scores:

1. Personal Satisfaction (differences factor)
2. Inability to Leave Work at the Office (perceptions factor)
3. Emotional Erosion (perceptions factor)
4. Hours per Week Spent in Direct Contact With Clients (demographic variable)
5. Sex (demographic variable)
6. Organizational Support (differences factor)
7. Lack of Worker Self Determination (expectations factor).

It is interesting to note that only two demographic variables discriminated at a significant level: the high burnout group consisted of a greater proportion of males and those in the high burnout group spent less time in direct contact with clients. The finding related to sex is consistent with the findings of the Berkeley Planning Associates (1977). Within the context of this research, it is likely that males are more preoccupied with organizational issues and are thus more likely to feel the frustration of perceived lack of external supports. The findings related to the amount of time spent in direct contact with clients is consistent with the findings of a number of authors (Kadushin, 1974; Kahn,
1978 and Sullivan, 1979) that burned out workers are more likely to try to avoid the stress of direct contact with clients and to spend more time on routine administrative duties.

The differences factor, Professional Satisfaction, is the factor that discriminates best between the high and low burnout groups. This factor relates to the worker's inability to develop good casework skills and to the perception that caseloads are unmanageable. It will be recalled that this was also the factor that was correlated most highly with burnout and requires little additional discussion here. It is interesting to note, however, that burned out workers place a high priority on practicing and developing casework skills and feel frustrated in their attempts to do so. It is also important to note that the high burned out group feels less in control of their caseloads. Unfortunately, it is impossible to distinguish from this data whether respondents perceive the overload as quantitative (i.e. related to the amount of work) or qualitative (i.e. dealing with the difficulty of the work) as discussed in McLean (1974). This is a distinction that researchers must make in future studies. It may be argued that the most conscientious workers are most frustrated by high caseloads because they are unable to invest the time required to deal with situations effectively.

Two perceptions factors, Inability to Leave Work at the Office and Emotional Erosion are the next two factors that discriminate at an extremely high level of significance.
between the two groups. These factors refer to an inability to separate work and home life, an unavailability of social outlets, a propensity to work overtime, an unpreparedness for intense emotional involvement and a feeling that court takes up too much time. These items should provide clear indicators for workers and supervisors to be aware of and to watch for.

The differences factor, Organizational Support and the expectations factor, Lack of Worker Self Determination discriminate at a significant but much lower level between the two groups. The high burned out group is more likely to perceive less organizational support (i.e. fewer opportunities for staff development, clinical advancement and positive feedback as well as experiencing a negative relationship with one’s supervisor) and is less likely to have expected autonomy within the setting.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research study was to examine whether or not unmet job expectations lead to burnout. The researchers sought to determine whether or not a state of dissonance would result from discrepancies between the expectations which an individual worker had when commencing employment as opposed to their perceptions of what in actuality they were experiencing on the job. This is consistent with Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance as that which the worker is obliged to do is often incongruent with his values, beliefs, goals and aspirations. The researchers questioned whether or not the amount of physical and psychological energy expended in attempting to resolve this dilemma would result in a state of burnout. Simultaneously, they sought to determine which factors drawn from the literature would be most significantly correlated with the incidence of burnout in the sample studied. In addition, they sought to develop a profile of burned out Children's Aid Society workers in southwestern Ontario.

The population for this study consisted of 128 front-line social workers in six southwestern Ontario, Children's Aid Societies as of June, 1980.

The data collection instrument was a questionnaire admin-
istered directly to the respondents by the researchers. Of the 128 questionnaires administered and returned 107 were suitable for analysis.

6.1 Major Research Findings

6.1.1 Components of Burnout

Analysis of data for the sample resulted in the identification of eight major components of burnout, as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory:
1. Callousness Toward Clients.
2. Identification With Clients.
3. Tedium.
4. Lack of Personal Accomplishment.
5. Detachment From Clients.
6. Ambivalence Toward Clients.
7. Worker's Feelings of Ineffectiveness.

For this sample, the burnout components that occurred most frequently and significantly were: Tedium, Callousness Toward Clients and Ambivalence Toward Clients.

6.1.2 Expectations Factors

The 27 conceptual variables derived from the literature resulted in the following 10 expectations factors:
1. Lack of Worker Self Determination.
2. Lack of External Resources and Support.
3. Feelings of Professionalism.
4. Workaholism.
6. Insufficient Recreational Opportunities.
8. Lack of Accountability.
9. Propensity to Challenge the System.
10. Unavailability of Work Breaks.

6.1.3 Perceptions Factors

The 27 conceptual variables derived from the literature resulted in the following eight perceptions factors:

1. Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service.
2. Lack of Organizational Support to the Individual Worker.
3. Inability to Leave Work at the Office.
6. Dissonance Between Personal Feelings and Professional Values.
7. Commitment to Direct Service.
8. Propensity to Challenge System.

6.1.4 Differences Factors

The 27 conceptual variables derived from the literature resulted in the following nine differences factors:

1. Organizational Support.
2. Lack of Professional Esteem.
3. Worker Self Determination.
4. Professional Satisfaction.
5. Facilitative Professional Milieu.
6. Obligation to Clients.
7. Ability to Deal With Court.
8. Adequacy of Compensation.

9. Worker Self Reliance.

6.1.5 Are Unmet Job Expectations Related to Burnout?

The general findings of this study indicate that some unmet job expectations are in fact related to burnout, which provides some support to the proposal that burnout is related to cognitive dissonance. Those specific areas in which unmet expectations are most significantly related to burnout are, in order of significance: Professional Satisfaction, Organizational Support, Adequacy of Compensation and Obligation to Clients. The components of burnout which are most significantly related to unmet expectations are: Tedium and Callousness Toward Clients. However, unmet job expectations are not the key to burnout. Rather, the researchers have found that current perceptions relate most significantly to and therefore most accurately determine, burnout as will be discussed further on.

6.1.6 What Factors are Most Significantly Related to Burnout?

As previously indicated, those factors which are most significantly related to burnout are perceptions followed by differences or unmet expectations (which have been outlined in the previous question) and lastly by expectations. The data reveals that the key perceptions items in order of significance are: Milieu Inhibiting Provision of Service, Lack of Organizational Support to the Individual Worker, Inability to Leave Work at the Office and Lack of Personal Support Systems. The key expectations item is Feelings of
Professionalism. The burnout factors that were most significantly related to perceptions were: Tedium and Ambivalence toward clients while the burnout factor most significantly related to expectations was Emotional Exhaustion.

6.1.7 What is the Profile of a Burned Out Worker?

The profile of a burned out social worker is as follows:

1. He experiences less professional satisfaction than he had originally expected (i.e., he is less able to develop good social work skills and his caseload is unmanageable),

2. He is less able to leave his work at the office (and consequently works a great deal of overtime and lacks recreational outlets),

3. He is unprepared for intense emotional involvement with clients and suffers emotional erosion,

4. He spends fewer hours per week in direct contact with clients than a worker who scores low on the M.B.I.,

5. He is more likely to be male,

6. He receives less organizational support than he had originally expected (i.e., there are fewer opportunities for work breaks, democratic decision making and positive feedback) and

7. He expects to experience minimal self-determination in a CAS setting (i.e., he expects the mandate to inhibit the development of a helping relationship and expects court to take up too much time).
6.2 Recommendations

Based on the findings and discussion, the researchers make recommendations in the following areas:
1. symptoms for which to be alert
2. organizational factors
3. personal factors
4. professional factors
5. recommendations for future research.

The overriding recommendation that arises out of this research is that agency administrators and front line workers must recognize the potency of the individuals' perceptions of their overall condition. It is imperative that perceptions must be addressed, regardless of their reality base, as shifts in these perceptions can prevent and ameliorate the condition of burnout.

The perceptions that have the greatest impact on Ontario CAS workers are those relating to a lack of support (see Table 4.2.2.2). These results suggest that social workers have high affiliation needs and therefore cannot tolerate a perceived lack of support from colleagues, supervisors, agency administrators, the community or the general milieu within which they work. Since feelings of isolation experienced by front line staff must be reduced, action in a number of areas is recommended.

6.2.1 Symptoms for Which to be Alert

The analysis of data does not determine which symptoms of burnout were most prevalent in the research sample. However,
Table 4.2.2.2 and Chapter 5.1 clearly demonstrate that certain clusters of symptoms (represented by the burnout factors) were more often and more significantly correlated with perceptions, expectations and differences factors.

The researchers recommend that all staff in CAS's be sensitive to and recognize the following symptoms of burnout:

a) workers who feel used up at the end of the work day;
b) workers who feel emotionally drained from their work;
c) workers who feel frustrated by their jobs;
d) workers who express concern that they are working too hard;
e) workers who express feelings of fatigue upon waking;
f) workers who feel that clients blame them for some of the clients problems;
g) workers who often indicate that they do not care about their clients;
h) workers who express discomfort about the way they have treated some clients;
i) workers who feel that they have become more callous toward people since commencing employment at CAS and
j) workers who regard clients as impersonal objects.

The data, however, does not suggest that workers who experience a few of these symptoms in isolation are burned out. Through sharing feelings with colleagues and in supervision individuals can be sensitized to a pattern of symptoms developing over a period of time.

6.2.2 Organizational Factors

All major results point to unmet expectations and percep-
tions in the area of organizational support as central to the phenomenon of burnout (see Table 4.2.2.2 and Chapter 5.2). Burned out workers perceive the organization as less supportive than originally expected and the results clearly point to a feeling of alienation and estrangement from the organization as being prevalent among burned out workers. Recommendations relating to organizational factors are divided into three areas:

a) those dealing with the general issue of recognition;
b) those dealing with the general issue of the use of time and
c) those dealing with overall participation in the organization.

6.2.2.1 Recognition. The results of this study demonstrate that direct service social workers in CAS' s perceive themselves as receiving inadequate recognition for the amount and quality of work expected of them and for the amount of responsibility they are expected to assume. The following recommendations are presented to address this issue:

a) that agency administrators recognize and deal with the perceptions of burned out workers that current salary levels are less adequate than they had originally expected (see Chapter 4.2.2.4).

b) that agency administrators recognize that caseloads are perceived by burned out workers as being too large (see Chapter 4.2.2.4 and Chapter 4.2.3). Therefore, caseloads should be re-examined from the perspectives of both number of cases and types of cases (caseweighting).
c) that agency administrators recognize that burned out workers perceive opportunities for clinical advancement as inadequate (see Chapter 5.2 and Chapter 5.3). Therefore, agency administrators must address the issue of job classification.

d) that opportunities to enhance skills be provided through consultation and staff development programs (see Chapter 4.2.2.4 and Chapter 4.2.3).

6.2.2.2 Use of Time. The efficient and effective use of time is a recurring theme in the results and discussion. Recommendations are made in a number of areas:

a) that administrators and staff be aware of and sensitive to the problem of the lack of availability of work breaks as perceived by burned out workers (see Chapter 5.4.1).

b) that the problem perceived by burned out workers of the inordinate amount of time spent in routine administrative duties be recognized and addressed (see Chapter 5.4.1).

c) that supervisors be sensitive to the amount of overtime worked by staff and explore with staff the factors responsible for an inability to complete work assignments within normal working hours (see Chapter 4.2.3).

6.2.2.3 Participation in the Organization. The results also demonstrate that direct service CAS workers do not feel comfortable within the workplace or the organization. Thus, the question of participation within the organization becomes crucial. The following recommendations are presented to address the areas of participation in the organization and
developing a general feeling of comfort in the workplace:

a) that agency administrators recognize the potency of burned out workers' perceptions of estrangement from the organization. Systems must be developed to allow front line staff to provide input into the development of policies and procedures and to be involved in the decision making processes. In this way, workers will feel that they are contributing to and becoming part of the agency.

b) that the issue of responsibility for cases (that is, does the ultimate responsibility lie with workers or with the agency?) be debated and clarified (see Chapter 5.3).

c) that agency administrators recognize the value of attractive physical environments (see Chapter 5.2).

6.2.3 Personal Factors

Direct service workers must take responsibility for the following recommendations dealing with their personal lives:

a) that all staff recognize the needs of themselves and their colleagues for positive feedback (verbal and nonverbal). Staff must make a point of saying something encouraging to fellow workers (see Chapter 4.2.2.3 and Chapter 5.3).

b) that workers develop adequate social and recreational outlets outside the workplace (as discussed in Chapter 4.2.3 and Chapter 5.4).

c) that workers balance the desirability of leaving work at the office with frank discussions with families of feelings regarding work (see Chapter 5.2).
6.2.4 Professional Factors

The results further indicate that burned out workers experience difficulty in a number of areas, such as use of authority and dealing with resistant clients. A number of recommendations are therefore focused on Schools of Social Work because these have primary responsibility for training workers and preparing them for the field:

a) that Schools of Social Work prepare students to face the fundamental problem of the constructive use of authority in settings governed by legal mandates (see Chapter 4.2.2.3).

b) that Schools of Social Work prepare students to encounter and to deal with resistant and uncooperative clients (see Chapter 4.2.2.3).

c) that Schools of Social Work help students to assimilate professional values and to achieve a balanced perspective between interpersonal values (such as unconditional positive regard, acceptance and a nonjudgmental attitude) and social values (such as social justice, equity and community) (see Chapter 4.2.2.5).

d) that Schools of Social Work prepare students to understand and function within organizations in order to counteract the pervasive feelings of alienation and estrangement experienced by burned out workers.

Further recommendations are made regarding social workers' sense of professionalism:
a) since social workers feel that the status of the profession is related to the difficulty of cases handled, that an area of professional expertise and performance standards be defined to enable the community to recognize good performance (see Chapter 5.3).

b) that social workers participate in their professional organizations with a view to improving standards of service and maintaining a high community profile.

6.2.5 Recommendations for Future Research

Since this research was exploratory, it is important to apply the results to future research. A number of areas for future study have been identified and are presented in the following recommendations:

a) that the factors that were demonstrated to be most highly correlated with burnout be studied in more depth. These factors were:

i) perceptions regarding milieu inhibiting provision of service,

ii) perceptions regarding lack of organizational support,

iii) perceptions regarding an inability to leave work at the office,

iv) perceptions regarding lack of professional and personal support systems,

v) unmet expectations regarding professional satisfaction,

vi) unmet expectations regarding organizational support,

vii) unmet expectations regarding adequacy of compensation,

viii) unmet expectations regarding obligation to clients,
ix) expectations regarding feelings of professionalism.
b) that recurring items within factors be studied in greater
depth in order to more thoroughly understand the issues
they represent. Some of these items include:
   i) professional values (i.e. which specific values
      are problematic?),
   ii) caseloads (i.e. the issue of quantitative versus
      qualitative overload),
   iii) work breaks (i.e. which types of work breaks are
       most effective?),
   iv) job classification.
c) that longitudinal studies be conducted in order to collect
data upon commencement of employment and at termination.
This will avoid the possibility of experience biasing
recollections of original expectations.
d) regression analysis can be conducted on this data to deter-
mine which symptoms of burnout are most pervasive in this
sample.
e) that the fundamental issue of organizational support be
examined in much greater depth and specificity.
f) that the question of why burned out social workers experi-
ience such high affiliation and support needs be examined
in greater depth.

It must be emphasized that the primary purpose of this
research was to isolate certain general factors that were most
significantly related to burnout in order to facilitate future
in-depth analyses. The results, discussion and recommendation
clearly demonstrate that this purpose has been achieved.
APPENDIX A

LETTER REQUESTING PERMISSION
TO PRETEST THE INSTRUMENT

AND LETTER TO DR. CHRISTINA MASLACH
April 15, 1980

Mr. John Doe
Director
County Children's Aid Society
Anytown, Ontario

Dear Mr. Doe:

Two M.S.W. students are undertaking a study "A Study of Job Expectations As Related To Burnout Among Direct Service Workers in Ontario Children's Aid Societies" as part of their requirements for the M.S.W.---Both students Glenda Fisher and Jim Boniferro are former staff members of Ontario Children's Aid Societies and the study is being conducted in Southwestern Ontario. I am Chairman of their thesis committee.

In order to carry out the study, (a proposal of which is attached), it is necessary for them to administer the enclosed questionnaire to Direct Service Social Workers. However, prior to doing so it is essential to pretest the instrument in order to receive feedback regarding it and to make whatever revisions are necessary for the study proper. Accordingly, I am writing to you on their behalf in order to request that they be allowed to administer the questionnaire to the workers in your agency for purposes of this pretest. Results of the test will be sent to you as soon as possible after its completion.

I would appreciate your help in facilitating this study and hope you can help us. If you have any questions please call me at the School of Social Work.

Yours sincerely,

H.M. Morrow
Professor

Attachment
Room 322 Electa Hall-Main

8 November 1979

Dr. Christina Maslach
Department of Psychology
University of California at Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720

Dear Dr. Maslach:

We are writing to introduce ourselves as master's students within the faculty of social work at the University of Windsor and to request assistance from you.

We are in the initial stages of a joint thesis which is entitled: An Examination of Individual and Organizational Characteristics Related to the Phenomenon of Burnout Among Direct Service Social Workers in Ontario Childrens Aid Societies. Each of us is from a different area of specialization, i.e., administration and intervention, however, we are integrating the two approaches within our work.

The area which we are presently developing is our data collection instrument. The instrument will consist of a written questionnaire, the questions being primarily closed in order to facilitate compilation of the data, although a few open ended questions will be included to provide an opportunity for individual input. The questionnaire will consist of at least three sections in order to determine the following:

1. Is the worker burned out? To be determined on the basis of job motivation, satisfaction and attitude scales.

2. What individual intrapersonal characteristics does the person possess? To be determined through personality and behavioral inventories.

3. What organizational dynamics is the person exposed to that contribute to, or alleviate, distress? To be determined by assessing the worker's view of administrative practices.

Needless to say, we have neither the time frame nor the expertise to develop our own measuring devices such as personality inventories, attitude scales, etc. We would appreciate if you would be kind enough to share with us, the methods and
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instruments which you have either used or developed or are aware of with respect to your research into the topic. In our review of the literature, including a number of articles by yourself, we have not come upon any discussion of the data collection methodology or measuring devices. Your direction in this respect would be greatly appreciated by both of us.

Thank you for your anticipated assistance.

Yours truly,

Glenda M. Fisher, B.S.W.

Jim Boniferro, B.A., B.S.W.
APPENDIX B

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

AND COVERING LETTER
The University of Windsor School of Social Work Survey of Ontario Children's Aid Society Workers.

This is a study being conducted by two M.S.W. candidates from the University of Windsor. The study consists of four parts designed to determine:

1. demographic or descriptive data;
2. your expectations upon accepting employment at C.A.S.;
3. your actual experiences as an employee of C.A.S.;
4. your feelings about your job, your clients and yourselves.

Please be assured that all information will remain strictly confidential and anonymous. Your honesty in responding to each of the questions will enable us to make recommendations for improved working conditions. We shall explain the purpose of our study in more detail after the questionnaires have been completed rather than before so as to avoid biasing your responses.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Jim Boniferro
Glenda Fisher
PART A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This first section contains questions that will provide information about your background. This information is needed so that we can compare answers of people who are grouped according to gender, age, occupation, etc.

1. Your sex is:     (1) male
                     (2) female

2. Your age is:      ___ years

3. Marital status:   (1) single
                     (2) married
                     (3) divorced
                     (4) widowed
                     (5) other (please specify__________)

4. What was the highest grade you completed in school? Check only ONE answer:
   (1) some high school
   (2) completed high school
   (3) some community college
   (4) completed community college
   (5) some university
   (6) completed university
   (7) some post graduate work or degree
   (8) other (please specify__________)

5. Please check the highest degree you have received. Check only ONE answer:
   (1) Child Care Worker diploma
   (2) Mental Retardation Counsellor diploma
   (3) R.N.
   (4) General B.A.
   (6) B.S.W.
   (7) M.A., M.Sc., M.Ed.
   (8) M.S.W.
   (9) Other (Please Specify__________)
5. In which department do you work?
   ___ (1) Family Services
   ___ (2) Children's Services
   ___ (3) Intake
   ___ (4) Adoption
   ___ (5) Generalist

7. How many hours per week do you work?
   ___ (1) 70 or more hours
   ___ (2) 50 - 59 hours
   ___ (3) 50 - 59 hours
   ___ (4) 40 - 49 hours
   ___ (5) 30 - 39 hours
   ___ (5) less than 30 hours

3. How long have you been at your present job?
   ___ (1) less than one half year
   ___ (2) between one half and one year
   ___ (3) between one and two years
   ___ (4) between two and three years
   ___ (5) between three and four years
   ___ (5) more than four years

3. How long have you been in the field of child welfare?
   ___ (1) less than one half year
   ___ (2) between one half and one year
   ___ (3) between one and two years
   ___ (4) between two and three years
   ___ (5) between three and four years
   ___ (5) more than four years
10. Of your total working time, indicate what percentage of that time you spend:
   ___ % in direct contact with clients
   ___ % in direct contact with other staff
   ___ % in professional training
   ___ % in administrative duties (i.e. time sheets, statistical reports, etc.)
   ___ % other (please specify _______________

   Total: ______ %

11. Approximately how many hours per week are you in direct contact with clients?
   ___ (1) 0 - 5 hours
   ___ (2) 6 - 10 hours
   ___ (3) 11 - 15 hours
   ___ (4) 16 - 20 hours
   ___ (5) 21 - 25 hours
   ___ (5) 26 - 30 hours
   ___ (7) more than 30 hours
PART B

EXPECTATIONS

Beginning a new job is a time of mixed emotions for most of us. The excitement and anticipation of a new challenge is tempered by the anxiety of entering the unknown. Take yourself back in time and try to experience the emotions and feelings of your first few weeks as a C.A.S. employee. Answer the following questions on the basis of what you expected to experience at C.A.S. during your period of employment here. Since we are studying expectations, do not allow your actual experiences to colour your responses.

Respond to each of the statements by circling the number that most closely indicates your level of agreement or disagreement with the statement.

An example is shown below:

30. Most of my colleagues will have blue eyes.

1 2 3 4 5
Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly disagree

If you felt that a majority of your colleagues would have eyes of a different colour, you would indicate this by circling the number five as shown above. Please proceed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My salary will be a fair reflection of the quantity and quality of work expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The criteria for success in child welfare will be too vague to provide me with a sense of accomplishment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>When the pressure becomes too great there will be opportunities for me to be &quot;spelled off&quot; (e.g., taking different kinds of cases, taking vacation, doing paper work for a day, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>In keeping with its expectations of C.A.S. workers, the community will provide the necessary resources and supports to achieve the mandate of protecting children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>It will bother me that my work will focus on the pain and suffering of children and their families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My training has left me unprepared for the repeated, intense, emotional involvement with clients that I will experience in this setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I will be praised by my supervisors and colleagues for a job well done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I will be able to practice and develop good social work skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Sufficient opportunities will exist for me at C.A.S. to advance in the clinical area (e.g., senior caseworker, salary increments, based on experience and expertise).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I will have adequate social or recreational outlets in my off-hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My obligation to uphold the legal mandate of the Child Welfare Act will hamper the development of a helping relationship with clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Most of my clients are going to be uncooperative or resistant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I will not have the chance to directly participate in the development of policies and procedures in this agency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>This agency will offer ample opportunity for staff development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The responsibility for the lives and well-being of the children on my caseload will be directly on my shoulders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I shall have a positive, constructive relationship of mutual respect with my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The physical environment here will be too uncomfortable to accomplish either administrative tasks or direct service to clients.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I expect to receive professional and personal support from my fellow workers in this agency.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I will be able to &quot;leave my work at the office&quot; so that it will not interfere with my personal life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Court work will take up too much of my time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. I will not have to spend excessive amounts of time on routine administrative duties (e.g. paperwork, time sheets, monthly statistics).

22. It will continually bother me that any of my cases may "blow" at any minute, like a time bomb.

23. As a good social worker I will not dislike any of my clients.

24. I expect social work to be regarded as a high status profession in the community.

25. My caseload will be of a manageable size.

26. I will find that the most effective way to change policies and procedures is to take things into my own hands and confront the system.

27. In order to finish my work, I will have to work many hours of overtime.
PART C

ACTUALITY

As time progresses, one encounters varying degrees of disappointment or finds that his or her original expectations are met (or even exceeded) within his or her occupation. Please respond to the following questions on the basis of how you perceive actual conditions in your agency today, as they affect your job.
YOUR PERCEPTION OF THE WAY IT IS NOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It continually bothers me that any of my cases may blow at any minute, like a time bomb.
   1   2   3   4   5

2. I have found that the most effective way to change policies and procedures is to take things into my own hands and confront the system.
   1   2   3   4   5

3. It bothers me that my work here focuses on the pain and suffering of children and their families.
   1   2   3   4   5

4. Sufficient opportunities exist for me at CAS to advance in the clinical area (e.g. senior caseworker, salary increments based on experience and expertise).
   1   2   3   4   5

5. I must spend an excessive amount of time on routine administrative work (e.g. paperwork, time sheets, monthly statistics).
   1   2   3   4   5

6. When the pressure becomes too great, there are opportunities for me to be "spelled off" (e.g. taking different kinds of cases, taking a vacation, doing paper work for a day).
   1   2   3   4   5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>In order to finish my work, I must work many hours of overtime.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Most of my clients are uncooperative or resistant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My salary is a fair reflection of the quantity and quality of work expected of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The criteria for success in child welfare are too vague to provide me with a sense of accomplishment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>The responsibility for the lives and well-being of the children on my caseload lies directly on my shoulders.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>In keeping with its expectations of C.A.S. workers, the community provides the necessary resources and supports to achieve the mandate of protecting children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>This agency offers ample opportunity for staff development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. I am able to "leave the work at the office" so that it does not interfere with my personal life.

1  2  3  4  5

15. I have no opportunity to directly participate in the development of policies and procedures in this agency.

1  2  3  4  5

16. Social work is a high status profession in the community.

1  2  3  4  5

17. I receive professional and personal support from my fellow workers in the agency.

1  2  3  4  5

18. I am able to practice and develop good social work skills.

1  2  3  4  5

19. As a good social worker I must not dislike any of my clients.

1  2  3  4  5

20. I have a positive, constructive relationship of mutual respect with my supervisor.

1  2  3  4  5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. My caseload is a manageable size.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Court work takes up too much of my time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My obligation to uphold the legal mandate of the Child Welfare Act hampers the development of a helping relationship with clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My training left me unprepared for the repeated intense, emotional involvement with clients that I experience in this setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The physical environment here is too uncomfortable to accomplish either administrative tasks or direct service to clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I am praised for a job well done by my supervisors and colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I have adequate social or recreational outlets in my off-hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART D

FEELINGS SURVEY

The following pages are several statements of job-related feelings you might have. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, check the box marked 'NEVER' and go on to the next statement. However, if you have experienced this feeling, indicate HOW OFTEN you feel it by circling the appropriate number on the 5-point scale. Then, decide HOW STRONG the feeling is when you experience it by circling the appropriate number on the 7-point scale. An example is shown below.

| Frequency of Feeling: HOW OFTEN: |
|-------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| NEVER                        | 1 A few times    | 2 Once a month     | 3 A few times a week | 4 Once a week | 5 Every day     |
|                               | a year or less  | or less            | or month          | or week       | or day          |

| Intensity of Feeling: HOW STRONG: |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 1 Very mild, barely noticeable   | 2 Moderate       | 3 Major, very strong |
| 4                               | 5                 | 6                  |
| 7                                |                   |                    |

Example:

30. I feel depressed at work.

HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6

HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6

If you occasionally feel depressed at work (for example, a few times a month) you would circle the number 3. If, when you do feel depressed, it is fairly strong feeling, but not as strong as you can imagine, you would circle a 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW STRONG:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very mild</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER
   HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I feel used up at the end of the workday.
   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER
   HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I feel similar to my clients in many ways.
   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER
   HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I feel personally involved with my clients' problems.
   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER
   HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER
   HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients.
   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER
   HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. I can easily understand how my clients feel about things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>HOW STRONG:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. I feel I treat some clients as if they were impersonal "objects".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>HOW STRONG:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Working with people all day is really a strain for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>HOW STRONG:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. I deal very effectively with the problems of my clients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>HOW STRONG:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. I feel burned out from my work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>HOW STRONG:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>HOW STRONG:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.

   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER         HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6
                     7

14. I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.

   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 5
   NEVER  HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I feel very energetic.

   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER  HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I feel frustrated by my job.

   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 5
   NEVER  HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.

   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER  HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I don't really care what happens to some clients.

   HOW OFTEN: 1 2 3 4 5 6
   NEVER  HOW STRONG: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19. Working directly with people puts too much stress on me.

How Often: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Never

How Strong: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients.

How Often: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Never

How Strong: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I feel exhilarated after working closely with my clients.

How Often: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Never

How Strong: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.

How Often: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Never

How Strong: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

How Often: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Never

How Strong: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.

How Often: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Never

How Strong: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. I feel clients blame me for some of their problems.

How Often: 1 2 3 4 5 6
Never

How Strong: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
APPENDIX C

SUBSCALES OF

MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY
SUBSCALES OF THE MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

(high degrees of burnout are reflected in high mean scores on A and B, and low scores on C)

A. Emotional Exhaustion

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.
4. Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
5. I feel burned out from my work.
6. I feel frustrated by my job.
7. I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
8. Working directly with people puts too much stress on me.
9. I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.

B. Depersonalization

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

C. Personal Accomplishment

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

D. Personal Involvement (optional subscale)

23. I feel similar to my recipients in many ways.
24. I feel personally involved with my recipients' problems.
25. I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some recipients.
APPENDIX D

PEARSON'S PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS ($r$)

FOR INTERCORRELATIONS OF MASLACH'S SUBSCALES;

FREQUENCIES M.B.I., INTENSITIES M.B.I. AND

COMBINED FREQUENCIES/INTENSITIES M.B.I. FACTORS
APPENDIX E

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS OF M.B.I.

FREQUENCIES AND INTENSITIES ITEMS COMBINED:

LOADINGS OF M.B.I. FREQUENCIES AND

INTENSITIES ITEMS ON FACTORS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors and Items</th>
<th>Factor I</th>
<th>Factor II</th>
<th>Factor III</th>
<th>Factor IV</th>
<th>Factor V</th>
<th>Factor VI</th>
<th>Factor VII</th>
<th>Factor VIII</th>
<th>Factor IX</th>
<th>Factor X</th>
<th>Factor XI</th>
<th>Factor XII</th>
<th>Factor XIII</th>
<th>Factor XIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope (in)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel burned out from my work (in)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job (in)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working directly with people puts too much stress on me (in)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work (in)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-02</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work (in)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work (in)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job (Pr)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job (Pr)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope (Pr)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callousness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've become more callous toward people</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've become more callous toward people</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-09</td>
<td>-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope (Pr)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal involvement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel personally involved with my clients' problems (Pr)</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel personally involved with my clients' problems (Pr)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel personally involved with my clients' problems (Pr)</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Lack of Accomplishment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very energetic (Pr)</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-05</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've accomplished many worthwhile things</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-07</td>
<td>-08</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>-01</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've accomplished many worthwhile things</td>
<td>-24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-06</td>
<td>-00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR VI</td>
<td>Frequency of Lack of Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel very energetic (Fr)</td>
<td>10  11  09  26  07  48  -17  -00  24  08  06  -07  00  03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I deal very effectively with the problems of my clients (Fr)</td>
<td>06  -14  12  -03  -20  44  24  09  -05  22  28  14  13  -08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job (Fr)</td>
<td>33  -12  12  -07  -08  66  03  36  04  20  -01  09  -01  16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I feel very energetic (In)</td>
<td>24  12  -06  04  09  19  -10  53  -06  -00  41  -09  10  07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR VII</th>
<th>Depersonalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel I treat some clients as if they were impersonal &quot;objects&quot; (Fr)</td>
<td>-08  -25  -02  17  18  09  01  -05  04  -04  05  10  -05  -02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel I treat some clients as if they were impersonal &quot;objects&quot; (In)</td>
<td>26  -02  23  20  21  -14  71  -05  06  -05  02  18  -06  -01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients (Fr)</td>
<td>-12  03  42  11  03  20  48  01  43  19  -16  09  04  -10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I feel uncomfortable (In)</td>
<td>-11  -09  -06  02  -24  18  16  53  02  34  33  01  15  02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR VIII</th>
<th>intensity of Lack of Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job (Fr)</td>
<td>-06  -02  10  -07  04  12  -04  80  -00  08  06  -05  02  02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel I'm positively influencing other peoples lives through my work (Fr)</td>
<td>11  -10  -00  05  01  -07  -10  55  -08  -17  16  07  17  28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel very effectively with the problems of my clients (In)</td>
<td>-11  -09  -06  -02  -24  18  16  53  02  34  33  01  15  02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR IX</th>
<th>Worker Culpability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel clients blame me for some of their problems (Fr)</td>
<td>-02  -12  17  -01  08  05  06  01  81  -12  09  28  -04  -06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel clients blame me for some of their problems (In)</td>
<td>36  -10  -13  04  10  03  02  -06  70  -03  07  15  05  14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR X</th>
<th>Lack of Self Assuredness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly (Fr)</td>
<td>10  -07  08  15  10  30  04  -11  -08  80  16  01  04  -01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly (In)</td>
<td>-01  10  -08  -11  17  02  -08  21  -00  21  17  16  15  15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR XI</th>
<th>Lack of Worker Comfort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I can really create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients (Fr)</td>
<td>13  -00  07  -05  05  30  02  05  02  17  73  05  -00  18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I can really create a relaxed atmosphere with my clients (In)</td>
<td>-05  09  05  -05  -05  -05  -07  04  36  14  16  24  -07  21  -01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR XII</th>
<th>Emotional Hardening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I don't really care what happens to some clients (Fr)</td>
<td>-05  13  09  13  06  03  08  02  15  04  -01  07  03  08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I don't really care what happens to some clients (In)</td>
<td>-22  14  15  22  05  00  17  -03  21  10  00  73  05  -09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR XII</th>
<th>Emotional Hardening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I don't really care what happens to some clients (Fr)</td>
<td>-05  13  09  13  06  03  08  02  15  04  -01  07  03  08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I don't really care what happens to some clients (In)</td>
<td>-22  14  15  22  05  00  17  -03  21  10  00  73  05  -09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR XIII</th>
<th>Lack of Worker Enthusiasm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel exhilarated after working closely with my clients (Fr)</td>
<td>-08  05  01  05  07  -03  -02  24  07  00  03  06  88  -00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel exhilarated after working closely with my clients (In)</td>
<td>17  08  05  -01  17  44  -04  01  -12  15  10  00  44  00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR XIV</th>
<th>Lack of Worker Sympathy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I can easily understand how my clients feel about things (Fr)</td>
<td>-05  -10  -09  00  02  14  -05  04  -06  07  10  -01  -03  06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I can easily understand how my clients feel about things (In)</td>
<td>-09  02  05  01  -05  -10  -01  44  11  03  -01  -01  13  03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIXED FACTORS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally (Fr)</td>
<td>-06  08  20  64  12  00  -01  -05  -06  -02  07  11  -00  -04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel frustrated by my job (In)</td>
<td>64  51  23  27  02  -00  -06  -05  -06  -00  09  -01  -01  -14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO FACTORS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel exhausted when I work up in the morning and have to face another day on the job (Fr)</td>
<td>31  48  22  16  20  31  21  18  -24  -13  15  08  -14  -10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I feel exhausted at the end of the workday (In)</td>
<td>45  40  09  00  24  04  14  -06  -06  -00  -32  04  04  -05  26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) I feel uncomfortable about the way I have treated some clients (In)</td>
<td>28  -13  16  24  17  05  35  07  45  32  -07  -14  03  -17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*high score indicates disagreement

**NOTE**: Figures are rounded to the nearest two decimal places and decimal points are removed.
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VITAE AUCTORI


He was subsequently employed at the Roman Catholic Children's Aid Society for the County of Essex from August, 1980 to April, 1981. As an intake worker, he was responsible for investigating and assessing allegations of children being in need of protection.

In May, 1981, Mr. Boniferro accepted employment with the Ontario Ministry of Community and Social Services, Children's Services Division as a Special Agreements Officer. In this capacity, he is responsible for assessing, approving and evaluating requests for funds for additional services for developmentally handicapped children in residential care.
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