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CHAPTER ONE
Statement of Problem

In recent years, much attention has been focused on the concept of burnout. Burnout is commonly understood to be negative feelings and/or behavior resulting from unsuccessful attempts to cope with stress conditions in the workplace (Daley, 1979). Burnout is characterized by physical and emotional exhaustion, chronic negative attitudes, and very low productivity.

A significant number of people in the helping professions experience burnout (Cherniss, 1980). Kurtz (1980) confirmed that a number of studies "describing" burnout among public school teachers have been conducted. Some of the causes of burnout have been identified (Freudenberger, 1980). Thus far, though, research has not clearly established if there is a relationship between when people experience burnout and variables such as their age at the time they report burnout. There is much to be learned about the relationship between burnout and a person's demographic characteristics.

Age as a variable, however, has been the subject of research in adult development. Gould (1972, 1975, 1978),
Sheehy (1977), Levinson (1978), and others have done research which provides evidence that different types of psychological development in adults are related to particular ages. Levinson (1978) has conceived an elaborate theory of male adult development that is age-graded.

Levinson claimed there are more than ten substages in a man's life. One specific substage is known as "Age Thirty Transition." All men, roughly between the ages of 28 and 33, are posited to go through this period of psychological development. A primary "task" of Age Thirty Transition is career appraisal. Career appraisal is an introspective experience wherein a man evaluates/ questions his original choice of career and his continued commitment to that career.

Levinson's (1978) research indicated that over 50 percent of all men experience a moderate to severe crisis associated with the task of career appraisal. Although the crisis experience is unique to each man, there are elements common to all the crises. Each man questions his career progression, the amount of satisfaction derived from his work, how worthwhile his work is, and the degree of commitment he feels to his work. The possibility that a significant number of men will experience a crisis related to their work sometime
between the ages of 28 and 33 could be a factor that correlates to the incidence of burnout among 28-to-33-year-old men.

The incidence of burnout among a select group of educators ranging in age from mid-thirties to 65 was recently revealed (Douglas, 1982). Douglas surveyed a group of men who had been evaluated by their administrators as being successful. All of the men had at least 10 years experience in the educational system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (also known as LDS or Mormon Church). The assumption was made that Douglas' sample was free of burnout because each man had been screened by two independent administrative evaluations of his performance. The purpose of the Douglas study was to determine the most effective deterrents to burnout as perceived by educators who had "avoided" burnout (Douglas, 1982). Five hundred and eleven men returned the Douglas questionnaire. Ten percent of the respondents indicated that they were experiencing burnout!

That situations exists where apparently "successful" educators perceive themselves as burned out illustrates the need for further research into the relationship between burnout and variables, such as age, that might serve as predictors of burnout.
Statement of Purpose

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the status of burnout and career appraisal (as defined and measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire) among educators in the LDS Church Education System having 6 to 10 years experience (typically 28 to 33 years old). Also, the 10 factors perceived as most effective in deterring burnout among the CES educators were determined; those findings were then compared to the respective findings from the Douglas (1982) study.

Review of Literature

The initial section of this literature review parallels the Douglas (1982) review and is essentially an abridgement which has been updated to include relevant findings of the past year.

Although much has been written about burnout, most of the literature is anecdotal or descriptive. Relatively little field research on burnout has been reported.

There were three primary sources of literature dealing with burnout. Psychiatrists, psychologists, etc., such as Cherniss (1980), Dixon (1980), Edelwich (1980), Kahn (1978), Weinstein (1979), and Freudenberger (1974, 1975, 1977, 1980) reported their findings. Typically, their research was clinical.
Observations and opinions of current and ex-workers in the helping professions comprised the second source of literature. Bardo (1979), Gentile (1980), and Grossnickle (1980) were representative.

The third source was from research. Maslach (1977, 1979) and Pine have conducted research in selected social service agencies, while Owens (1980) and McIntyre (1982) were among those who did research with educators.

**Definitions of Burnout**

The psychoanalyst Freudenberger was generally credited with coining the term burnout in 1974 (Edelwich, 1980; Freudenberger, 1980). Since then it has become a catch word.

Burnout is described by its symptoms as well as its definitions. Freudenberger said that burnout was:

A state of fatigue, a frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward. Whenever expectation level is dramatically opposed to reality and the person persists in trying to reach that expectation, trouble in on the way. (1980, p. 13)

Reed noted that burnout is especially noticeable among the helping professions of social work and teaching and quoted a Boston University rehabilitation counselor who characterized burnout as "the feeling of being locked into a job routine" (1979, p. 79). Minahan (1980) also indicated that burnout was primarily attributed to
job-related stress. Gentile (1980, p. 332) defined burnout as "a debilitating psychological condition resulting from disgruntled employment experiences which foster low morale and productivity."

Attitudes of the Burnout

Scrivens (1979, p. 35) reported a colleague's comment as typical of a burnout: "Other years I've felt like I was ready for summer vacation in April, but this year I felt like that in November."

In research conducted by Memphis State University, Smith (1980, p. 53) reported that 90 percent of the public school teachers surveyed in Tennessee said: "I would not choose to be a teacher if I had it to do over again."

Burnouts feel a loss of enthusiasm, a lack of involvement, and work has become a drudgery because there is no feeling of reward. In short, life has lost much of its meaning. As described by Freudenberger (1980, p. 3), "some vital spark inside these men and women is burning out, leaving a terrible void."

Those experiencing burnout suspect they are unappreciated and often are angry or bitter. They feel a sense of depletion and suffer from low self-esteem (Freudenberger, 1980). Prior to experiencing burnout, the victims of burnout were overcommitted/overdedicated to their jobs (Bardo, 1979). As a result of
burnout, though, the victims lacked commitment and dedication to their work. Edelwich (1980) also noted that his burnout clients were particularly prone to doubt and disillusionment.

**Health Symptoms and Behavior of the Burnout**

Freudenberger (1980) noted that his patients suffering from burnout were not constantly depressed, but only in their work setting. This circumstantial depression was one quality that separated burnout from genuine depression. Several counselors maintained that instead of feeling guilt, a victim of burnout usually felt angry (Freudenberger, 1980; Murray, 1981).

In a study of teacher health concerns, Hardin (1976) asserted that many psychosomatic illnesses were aggravated by burnout. Through research involving child-care workers, Maslach (1977) concluded that burnout victims had a high rate of absenteeism and would often quit their jobs. Murray (1981) observed that a burnout appears nervous because he moves in a rapid, awkward manner and may attempt to do several tasks simultaneously, such as talking on the telephone and reading.

Freudenberger (1980) articulated the idea that burnouts suffer their own peculiar "disorientation" that includes forgetting often-used names and telephone
numbers, having a progressively shorter attention span, and developing irregular speech patterns.

**Progressive Stages of Burnout**

There were two models that attempted to portray burnout as a process. Edelwich (1980) and Freudenberger (1980) both created models that showed the stages of disillusionment (1980, pp. 27-30, 42). The stages of burnout in the Edelwich model were: enthusiasm, stagnation, frustration, apathy, and intervention.

The stage of enthusiasm was one of high hopes, high energy, and high expectations. According to Edelwich, this was actually a stage of disillusionment because "the very seeds of burnout are contained in the assumption that the real world will be in harmony with the neophyte idealist's dream." Freudenberger (1980) agreed that those susceptible to burnout are limited to the dynamic, charismatic, magnetic, goal-oriented person or the determined idealist. Kahn (1980, p. 62) perceived that "some people will never burnout . . . because they were never on fire to begin with." Cherniss (1980) has mentioned a point often taken for granted: people starting new careers often have unrealistic expectations of what they can accomplish.

Edlewich (1980) maintained that at the heart of the unrealistic expectation was the belief that one can make
a significant difference in the world by his/her work. When, for whatever reasons, the idealist's expectations were not met, then disillusionment set in.

When enthusiasm had been thwarted, the professional entered the stage of stagnation. Stagnation was the process of being stalled. The professional felt powerless and unappreciated. It was "literally the revolution of unfulfilled expectations" (Edelwich, 1980, P. 71).

No longer being able to see or assess the results of his work produced frustration. Chronic frustration was the third stage of burnout and was at its "core," said Edelwich (1980, p. 110). At this stage, hostility, resistance and anger were evident. Numerous emotional, physical, and behavior problems occurred at this stage of burnout.

The fourth stage of burnout was manifested as apathy. Apathy, or emotional detachment, was seen by Edelwich as a defensive mechanism against chronic frustration. "When one's work is no longer meaningful, one naturally feels the impulse to walk out" (Edelwich, 1980, p. 179).

Although intervention is not technically a sequential stage in Edelwich's model, it is discussed here. He said that intervention in the burnout syndrome can occur at any stage from enthusiasm to apathy.
Edelwich proposed intervention methods for each stage of burnout.

Freudenberger (1980) described the burnout stages of exhaustion, detachment or denial, and boredom or cynicism. The first distress signals were loss of energy and feelings of weariness. Many of the behaviors and attitudes symptomatic of exhaustion were exhibited.

In the second stage, the burnout candidate felt let down by the people and situations around him. Denial often began with a great hurt or grave disappointment. In order to avoid more hurt, the burnout stood apart by only "acting" his role.

Depending upon the person and the circumstances, the victim of burnout acted either cynical or bored. In the third stage of burnout, behavior could be quite incongruous at different times.

**Causes of Burnout**

Muldryon (1980) said burnout came from three sources: environmental factors, i.e., work and home setting, one's community; cultural predispositions, such as the work ethic in this country, the concepts that right will prevail and the dedicated get ahead; and finally, the personal characteristics of the individual.

Alley (1980) identified four different sources of stress: personal (one's actions), interpersonal
(conflicts with students or colleagues); institutionally caused stress (such as school policies); and finally, societal stressors (inflation, crime, etc.).

Douglas (1982) used the following three categories in examining causes of burnout: (1) societal factors (the economy, crime, etc.); (2) employment factors including both the immediate job setting and the larger organization and its philosophy; and finally, (3) individual factors, including individual characteristics and age.

**Societal Factors Contributing to Burnout**

Gentile (1980) articulated the obvious when he observed that vast social, religious, technological, economic, and political upheaval during the decade of the seventies sent shock waves throughout every aspect of society. In less than two decades, most of the structure supporting society disintegrated. Freudenberger (1980, p. 2) stated: "Burnout is a demon born of the society and times we live in, and our ongoing struggle to invest our lives with meaning." Scrivens (1980, p. 35) claimed the high incidence of teacher burnout was due to "a species of future shock" wherein older teachers were out of tune and unable to understand or cope with a new breed of children and teenagers.
Argyris (1964) reviewed the impact of typical organizations upon the individual workers and noted the inconsistency between the mature adult personality and typical expectations of most organizations. Argyris pointed out a deleterious condition commonly found in modern organizations and summarized his findings by formulating three propositions:

1. There is a lack of congruence between the needs of healthy individuals and the demands of the formal organization. An organizational disturbance is created in proportion to the degree of incongruence.

2. The results of this disturbance are frustration, failure, short-term perspective, and conflict. If the organization's members are mature and self-actualizing, they experience frustration and failure because they are not permitted to define their own goals and paths; they see their future as uncertain; the consequence of these conditions is conflict.

3. The nature of the formal principles of organization cause the subordinate, at any given level, to experience competitive rivalry, intersubordinate hostility, and a focus toward the parts rather than the whole.
Burnout in the Immediate Job Setting

Edelwich (1980, pp. 174-175) commented that "getting from one end of a career to the other is risky. If you overcommit yourself to such an unreliable, fickle force, you're bound to burnout." The literature identified at least eight causes of burnout in the job setting.

Particular mention was made of an insight both Owens (1980) and Edelwich (1980) noted: when response and appreciation from students or clients are lacking, professionals are largely left without a measuring device to assess their effectiveness as helpers. Edelwich continued by saying the lack of intrinsic rewards was a major cause of burnout.

There was little mention in the Douglas literature regarding burnout caused by the poor self-image of helping professionals as a result of community assessment of their worth. It is generally accepted that very little status or prestige is associated with the work of a public school teacher as compared to the work of other professionals such as lawyers.
Contributions of Organizational Structure and Philosophy to Burnout

Douglas (1982, p. 35) explained that:

Important employment considerations that are a source and cause of employee burnout often have little to do with problems and circumstances correctable at the work place. These deleterious conditions exist because structure, policy or philosophy, or the lack thereof, originating farther up the line of authority to top management and administration, have a spill-down effect on the local units and employees.

Freudenberger (1980), Cherniss (1980), Edelwich (1980), Minahan (1980), and Owens (1980) all cited powerlessness and lack of control over one's activities as the major frustration that leads directly to burnout. Owens (1980) studied burnout among Georgia's public school teachers. Those teachers believed that they possessed little control over the structure and direction of their jobs. Sixty percent of the teachers reported that they were not given sufficient rationale by administrators for the important policies regarding their work. They received little respect for their professional opinions. As a consequence, their sense of autonomy and self direction was limited. Furthermore, the socializing effect of the school's institutional character exacerbated their sense of powerlessness. Stereotyped roles frustrated the teachers.
A final cited cause of burnout because of organizational structure and policy in the teaching and social service agencies was associated with the absence of any career ladders in such institutions. There are several reasons for this. Owens (1980) attributed it to the fact that social service organizations have no major extrinsic incentives such as sizable salaries, stratified power, or income schedules based on performance.

**Individual Factors Causing Burnout**

Thus far, society, the corporate organization, and the job setting have been examined for the influences within them that foster burnout. It appeared, though, that of major significance is the pre-disposition to burnout of the individual.

**Personality factors in burnout.** Both Weinstein (1980) and Freudenberger (1980) listed several common characteristics of the worker who becomes a burnout. They are idealistic with unrealistic expectations. Almost without exception, they begin their career with some lofty ideal which results in overcommitment to their work. The burnout's personality may reflect uncommonly high needs for praise, recognition, reward, or appreciation. He is, as identified by Freudenberger
(1980), one who believes that what he does must be of consequence and should be of consequence to others. The burnout lacks kindness, largely toward himself, and to a much less extent toward peers. Freudenberger (1980, 0. 208) called the burnout his "own primary whipping boy." No matter what he does for others, no matter how successful he is, it is not enough. Freudenberger (1980, p. 153) also suggested that the burnout attempts to live up to standards he accepted in his immature years which were externally imposed. With his high sense of idealism, great dedication, and missionary zeal, the burnout candidate may also be the victim of a personal or institutional philosophy in which there is no provision for wrong or failure.

Freudenberger (1980, p. 205) cited 10 questions that he asked patients. Too many "yes" responses portend the pre-disposition to burnout:

1. Do you feel yourself under pressure to succeed all the time?  
2. Do you need to generate excitement again and again to keep from feeling bored?  
3. Is one area of your life disproportionately important to you?  
4. Do you feel a lack of intimacy with the people around you?  
5. Are you unable to relax?  
6. Are you inflexible once you've taken a stand on something?  
7. Do you identify so closely with your activities that if they fall apart, you do too?  
8. Are you always worried about preserving your image?  
9. Do you take yourself too seriously?  
10. Are your goals unclear; shifting back and forth between long-range and immediate?
Gradually investigations into the personality characteristics of educators are revealing who is most "susceptible" to burnout. In research involving 162 middle school and junior high teachers, Fielding (1982) reported that specific personality traits correlated with reports of burnout. Those teachers having an "external" locus of control and low tolerance for ambiguity were most likely to indicate feelings of burnout. Fifty percent of Fieldings (1982) sample perceived feelings of stress while 36 percent admitted feelings of burnout.

McIntyre (1982) conducted research with 469 special education teachers in Connecticut and Massachusetts to examine the relationship between locus of control and burnout. The Maslach Burnout Inventory was adapted for use in the survey. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) consisted of three subscales that measure: (1) degree of emotional exhaustion, (2) degree of depersonalization, and (3) sense of personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1978). The teachers who were measured as having more "external" locus of control were those who reported a greater degree of burnout.

Three hundred ninety-eight teachers in New York and New Jersey recently participated in another study on burnout (Farber, 1982). The teachers responded to a 65-item questionnaire derived from the MBI. Farber's (1982) purpose was to determine what factors in their
workplace motivated the teachers and what were the stress factors at work. The teachers were divided into three age groups: 21 to 33, 34 to 44, and 45 to 65. The factors most satisfying were those experiences that made the teachers feel competent, experiences where the teachers were involved with their students, and success experiences in their relationships with colleagues. Lack of a career ladder, ineffective administrative meetings, and too much paperwork were the major sources (factors) causing stress. There were few apparent differences among subgroups in the findings, with one exception.

The correlation between feelings of burnout and lack of commitment to education in the 34 to 44 age group was .49 (Farber, 1982). Farber (1982) concluded that the teachers most vulnerable to burnout were those traversing through a period where they felt less commitment to their work than was usually present.

*The age factor in burnout.* Edelwich's experience with clients suffering from burnout led him to conclude that burnout occurred without regard to age (1980). In contrast, Owens' (1980) research with Georgia school teachers indicated that burnout occurred most frequently among teachers ranging in age from 31 to 40, and those over age 50 experienced the least amount of burnout.
A New York state teacher survey provided evidence to support what Owens learned about burnout with respect to age. The New York survey (Stress, 1980) found that teachers from 31 to 40 reported feeling the most stress. One could conjecture that a relationship existed between the period of greatest stress, 31-40, and the period of weakest commitment to education, 31-40 (Farber, 1982).

Sweeney (1981) conducted a study of teacher satisfaction within 23 Iowa high schools, each having more than 1,000 students. Of the 1,295 teachers who responded to the Sweeney survey, those teachers between ages 25 and 34 were found to be least happy (Sweeney, 1981). McIntyre (1982) also reported that teachers 20-40 years old scored higher on the subscale of the MBI measuring emotional exhaustion than did the 41-50 year old educators. The highest incidence of burnout among the educators surveyed by Douglas (1982) was in the 36-40 year old age group.

Firm generalizations about the correlation of age to burnout were not possible, though, because there was contradictory evidence. The "midlife crisis" many people experience was investigated by Sheehy (1977), and she observed that typically a man in his forties feels unappreciated, restless, and burdened. A number of men were reported to have changed careers while in their
forties (Sheehy, 1977). The description of midlife frustrations provided by Sheehy closely paralleled many of the symptoms of job-related burnout.

**Deterrents to Burnout**

Many synonyms were used to convey the idea that burnout could be deterred: coping, combating, alleviating and managing. Edelwich (1980) asserted that prevention of burnout was not possible, that burnout "will happen perhaps repeatedly--and must be dealt with on an ongoing basis" (p. 246). On the other hand, Freudenberger (1980) stressed that deterrents to burnout could and must be erected. Scrivens (1980) said that burnout could be overcome at any of its stages and that no one had to remain in the condition of being burned out.

To be truly effective in deterring burnout, Maslach (1978) said that employers should not focus their attention on the "bad people" who burn out, but rather direct their attention toward the characteristic "bad situations" that many good people work in daily.

Organizational deterrents to burnout. To reiterate the words of Edelwich (1980, p. 185), "Getting from one end of a career to the other is risky. If you overcommit yourself to such an unreliable, fickle force, you're bound to burn out." Burnout was symptomatic of
an ailing career, and when burnout occurred, both the individual and the organization hurt and lost.

Both Minahan (1980) and Edelwich (1980) suggested that management should use organizational behavior consultants to learn more about the social-psychological dynamics of work organizations; the value of worker participation in decision making and the importance of "recognition" and "autonomy" in developing increased motivation, so that such considerations would guide them in future management decisions. Much that has been learned in a study of organizational behavior could be useful in deterring burnout.

For example, there were many aspects of the "career" concept. Each individual conceived a unique "internal career"--in which he has worked out his own particular life pattern of work; while the organization has developed an "external career"--which consists of a path employees are expected to follow throughout their working life in the organization (Van Maanen & Schein, 1977). Strauss (1978) explained that career should be conceptualized as a process of continual "negotiation" between employee and organization. When burnout occurs, the negotiations have faltered.

Super (1957, 1969), Cain (1964), Roe and Baruch (1967) all have articulated the notion that normally a man's career evolves through various stages. Career
stages parallel the broad stages of personal development in a man's life. In effect, a career or occupation is composed of substages of development.

Schein (1978, p. 24) presented a model of life that helps illustrate the interaction between personal and career development (Figure 1). Schein (1978) and DeLong (1982) have also introduced the construct of "career anchors." Through research at MIT and in Utah, it has been determined that after several years of work experience each person begins to acquire a basic orientation (or anchor) toward his work. These "orientations" or "anchors" include the need for security, the feeling of competence in performance, the desire to create, and the desire for autonomy. Thus far, research has discovered that there are eight general orientations that can develop because of an individual's work experiences. When both the organization and the individual are aware of an employee's particular "anchor," there are increased possibilities for deterring burnout.

Organizations can help provide strong support networks as a means of deterring burnout. From an educational administration viewpoint, Ricken (1980) asserted that "growing" teachers do not burnout and that able supervisors guiding support networks are essential to ensure continual growth for all teachers. While
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A Model of Life/Career/Family Cycle Interaction
studying burnout among police officers, Maslach (1979) learned that 80 percent of the officers' wives were involved in some support group as opposed to 10 percent of the officers being involved in any type of formal support group. In that study (Maslach, 1979), support groups were found to be helpful in deterring burnout. Minahan (1980) said that unless annual workshops for employees are accompanied by a sound, ongoing support program, the workshops are a band-aid approach to burnout and may only create a "workshop high" false cure.

When organizations clearly defined policies, goals, and job descriptions, burnout could be deterred (Edelwich, 1980, Owens, 1980). Owens (1980) found that many teachers reported a sense of powerlessness based in part on not having well-defined objectives by which to measure their performance.

Muldroon (1980) discovered that workers in the helping professions often listed too little decision-making power as a primary cause of burnout. An organizational philosophy of appropriate democratic leadership would contribute to increased worker satisfaction and professional growth, and thus deter burnout.

At the conclusion of his study of burnout among Georgia teachers, Owens (1980) stated:

Teacher training institutions also must accept increased responsibility for combating teacher burnout. Teacher preparation should include
additional information on possible sources of stress within the teaching environment, and provide teacher candidates with effective coping strategies. Rather than focusing exclusively on methodology, pre-service training should address organizational and societal aspects of teaching and the demands of the teachers' role. Such preparation would enhance teachers' abilities to clarify and fulfill their needs without succumbing to burnout. (1980, p. 20)

Reed (1980), Minahan (1980), Hendrickson (1980), and Freudenberger (1980) all recommended that in some way work responsibilities be altered or rotated on a periodic basis.

Individual deterrents to burnout. A plethora of recommendations have been forwarded as to what the individual can do to deter burnout. It is noted, though, that most of the people making suggestions as to effective behaviors and attitudes in deterring burnout have little hard data to support their recommendations. Common sense and personal experience are the bases for most of the following proposals.

Smith (1980) found that educators with positive attitudes who were always planning new professional activities avoided burnout. Establishing professional and personal goals that are drawn out over an extended period of time was presented by Gentile (1980) as a deterrent to burnout. Edelwich (1980) cautioned that burnout is usually a chronic attitude problem and that
it is unreasonable to expect short-term achievement of goals.

Minahan (1980) and Murray (1981) found that daily exercise, meditation, and improved diet helped some people deter burnout. Freudenberger (1980) and Edelwich (1980) both stressed the importance of a well-rounded life in deterring burnout. There must be something other than work that one can look forward to with anticipation. In some cases, it is probably necessary for the victim of burnout to receive counseling.

For many people to deter or overcome burnout, it would be necessary to quit their jobs and find another profession (Edelwich, 1980).

Overview of Adult Development Theory

The psychoanalyst Erik Erickson can be considered the father of adult developmental psychology. He proposed a theory in which he identified eight stages in the human life cycle (Elkind, 1970). Erickson's theory was an attempt to explain the psychosocial development of the ego. Of the eight stages, three occurred after a person is considered an adult.

Erickson indicated that each stage began as a result of a crisis (Elkind, 1970). In Erickson's theory, crisis had to do with resolution of an internal struggle involving development of the ego. The concept of crisis
as the catalyst in psychological development has been acknowledged in one form or another in all models of adult development since first proposed. The definition of crisis, though, has changed substantially since first used by Erickson.

Currently, adult development theorists occupy a spectrum of positions with regard to how adults change and grow. Probably the most publicized view was expounded by Dr. Levinson. His research was the basis of Sheehy's (1977) *Passages*. His notion was that particular developmental changes, or transitions, are closely linked to chronological age (Levinson and others, 1978). This idea of "age-grading" is quite controversial among Levinson's fellow theorists. Greater attention to Levinson's theory is given later.

Gould (1972) was also considered a "stage" theorist similar to Erickson in his conception of adult personality development. He claimed that the stages, or phases of development, are sequenced, but not necessarily age-specific. Gould (1972, p. 18) described the phases as "a sequence of process fluctuations that define the posturing of the self to its inner and outer world over time." The way an individual's perception of time changes was a key precept in his model. Gould's theory did not address late adulthood. He hypothesized four developmental periods through middle age (Gould, 1978). One
grows through resolution of internal crisis which requires the thoughtful confrontation of beliefs acquired during childhood (Gould, 1975). At each of these phases, it is necessary to reexamine and readjust a "major false assumption" remaining from childhood (Gould, 1978).

The term "stage" is used in a different sense by those researchers primarily concerned with task rather than age, per se. In reporting their findings, Lowenthal, Thurnher, and Chiriboga (1975) concluded that "it is not so much being 40 years old that is important as being 40 years old and having adolescent children or being 40 years old and recently divorced" (1975). It should be noted, however, that these theorists spoke of four distinct stages of life.

"Life-course perspective," "life-span development approach" and "life-events framework" are synonymous terms used by several different groups opposed to the strict stage theorists. Brim and Kagan (1980, p. 13) were representative of this group and based their stance on the idea that "stages cast development as unidirectional, hierarchal, sequenced in time, cumulative and irreversible--ideas that are not supported by commanding evidence." No definitive theory has been offered by these groups, but several propositions were advanced:
(1) developmental change and aging form a continual process, not limited to any particular stage of life, (2) change occurs in various interrelated social, psychological, and biological domains of human behavior and functioning, and . . . (3) life-course development is multidetermined. Thus, according to this viewpoint, to understand a particular stage of life--including middle and old age--it is necessary to place it within the context of the preceding and following developmental changes and stabilities and within its historical context. (Abeles and Riley, 1976, p. 3)

Neugarten's (1979) position as an adult development theorist was directly opposite that of Levinson's. Her emphasis was on "individual fanning out," rather than an invariant sequence. She proclaimed: "As lives grow longer, as the successive choices and commitments accumulate, lives grow different from each other" (p. 891). Neugarten (1964, 1968) conducted significant studies on aging, and her credibility as a researcher is respected.

Evidence from the Grant Study would tend to support Neugarten's viewpoint. One of Vaillant's (1977) conclusions was that: "The life cycle is more than an invariant sequence of stages with single predictable outcomes. The men's lives are full of surprises" (p. 373). Vaillant articulated four distinct levels of development: psychotic, immature, neurotic, and mature. Only certain adults reach the fourth level. Vaillant claimed that reality, instinct, conscience, and interpersonal relationships were the major aspects of human behavior.
He concluded that development is dependent upon choice of defense mechanism in given situations (Vaillant, 1977).

Although cursory, the overview accurately depicted the diversity of perception among theorists regarding adult development. In spite of the differences, though, there is concurrence in the belief that adulthood is more than a period of marking time.

A Closer Look at Levinson's Theory

Beginning in 1969, Levinson and four colleagues elaborated a theory of adult development. Their theory was based on several years of research, which consisted of the extensive interviewing and psychological testing of 40 men. Levinson used the term biographical interviewing, which he explained "combines aspects of a research interview, a clinical interview and a conversation between friends" (Levinson, 1978, p. 15). The 40 men selected as subjects were between the ages of 35 and 45. The subjects represented four categories (10 each): blue collar workers paid on an hourly basis, middle level executives, academic biologists, and novelists. A diversity of people were selected in terms of social class origins, racial, religious and ethnic backgrounds, education and marital status. All were American born, and each had been married at least once. It was acknowledged that the sample could not be considered
representative of the average American male. The major thrust of the study was to examine the choices made by each man during his life and how he had dealt with the consequences of his decisions.

Levinson announced that there were four main "seasons" of life: (1) childhood and adolescence—birth to 22 years, (2) early adulthood—17 to 45 years, (3) middle adulthood—40 to 65 years, and (4) older adulthood—60 years and older. He declared that "even the most disparate lives are governed by the same underlying order—a sequence of eras and developmental periods" (Levinson, 1978, p. 64). The purpose behind development was referred to as "individuation," or the process of becoming more unique as an individual throughout life. Maslow would have spoken in terms of becoming more "self-actualized."

Levinson hypothesized that there were more than 10 substages in the course of life. He divided life into three phases: the novice phase, the settling down phase, and the midlife transition (Figure 2) (Levinson, 1978, p. 57).

As explained by Levinson, the adult years consisted "of a series of alternating stable (structure-building) periods and transitions (structure-changing) periods" (1978, p. 49). There are particular tasks associated with both types of periods. A man must make certain
Figure 2

Developmental Periods in Early and Middle Adulthood
key choices around which to build a life structure and that is the primary task of every stable period. On the other hand, the primary tasks of every transitional period are to question and appraise/evaluate the existing structure (1978, p. 49).

A transition is a bridge between two states of greater stability and is "required to terminate the past and start the future" (1978, p. 50). Each transition is associated with a particular span of years. Linking a developmental transition with certain ages is the core of "age-grading." This concept is crucial to Levinson's theory because it is the basis for his assertion that adults continue in lifelong systematic psychological growth, rather than merely experience directionless change.

According to Levinson, a period of stability can last no longer than 10 years because in time "its utility declines and its flaws generate conflict that leads to modification or transformation of the structure" (1978, p. 54). Levinson intimated that a man must periodically question the assumptions upon which his life is built. Which assumptions he questions depends upon his age.

Rather than examine each of the three phases respectfully, emphasis will be given exclusively to the novice phase. The primary objective of this study involved measurement of one specific experience posited to
be a universal experience among those ranging in age from 28 to 33. Those years (28-33) were the stated parameters for the developmental transition known as "Age Thirty Transition," which is found within the novice phase.

The novice phase. Early Adult Transition, Entering the Adult World, and Age Thirty Transition constitute the novice phase of development, which extends from ages 17 to 33 (1978, p. 56). The Early Adult Transition was described as a "developmental bridge" between the eras of pre-adulthood and early adulthood. In Levinson's words:

The boy-man is on the boundary between the childhood era, which was centered in the family of origin, and the early adult era with its new responsibilities, roles and life choices. He is half in and half out of both worlds. (1978, p. 73)

The first major task of this transition involved changing the character of the relationship with one's family. For approximately the first seventeen years of life, the family of origin had been the center of a person's life. To function as a young adult in an adult world, it was necessary to establish a new home base (Levinson, 1978).

Levinson referred to the second major task of this period as initiating early adulthood. During this time one is engaged in the process of growing from a "teen-ager" to a "young man." A profound role change usually occurs. There is generally quite a shift in "cultural
expectations." Many new eresponsibilities are acquired. Obviously, the two tasks are interrelated.

Almost without exception, young men at this time in their lives are involved in college/trade school, military service, or full-time work. In most cases, the young man is more autonomous than at any previous time in his life. He is actively making choices that reflect his values. Typically, young men are making decisions about their perceived "life work." Ideally, career exploration takes place.

Other equally significant experiences occurred during this four-to-five-year period. For example, over one half of Levinson's sample got married at that time (1978, p. 77). The significance of marriage probably could not be overemphasized. Marriage or marriage/family is regarded as one of the three most significant components of a man's life. Many psychologists speak of a man's occupation, marriage/family, and religion as the three major "arenas" of life. Crucial decisions in each of these three areas are made during the Early Adult Transition.

Around age 22, a more stable period begins. Levinson called this the "Entering the Adult World" period, and it lasted about six years (1978, p. 79). As in the previous period of development, there are two major tasks facing the young man. These two tasks are antithetical:
exploration versus creating a stable structure. Levinson contrasted the positions this way:

The exploratory stance requires him to "hang loose," keeping his options open and avoiding strong commitments. To varying degrees, the external world provides multiple possibilities and invites the young man to try different choices before making firm commitments. Even when he makes relatively binding initial choices regarding marriage and occupation, they still have a provisional quality if they don't work out; change is still possible. (However) he must take on adult responsibilities and "make something of his life." Externally, there are pressures to "grow up," get married, enter an occupation define his goals and lead a more organized life. (1978, p. 79).

So, during his twenties, a young man is essentially building his own world. He is attempting to fulfill obligations which are a result of earlier decisions: i.e., supporting his new, growing family. He is taking his place in society by carrying out the responsibilities of an adult.

It is appropriate to note here that in addition to developmental tasks which are "peculiar" to each substage of life, there are common tasks which characterize each of the three phases of life. There are four major tasks in the novice phase:

1. Forming a dream and giving it a place in the life structure
2. Forming mentor relationships
3. Forming an occupation
4. Forming love relationships, marriage and family.
They are considered common tasks because work on them is ongoing through each successive period of development. Levinson declared that there were at least eight other common tasks associated with the novice phase, which is indicative of the highly complex process involved in forming an adult identity. However, the four tasks just enumerated "give the novice phase its shape and substance" (1978, p. 91).

A brief explanation of the first three "common" tasks is presented in an effort to establish the context in which Age Thirty Transition is located. It should be remembered that a basic objective of the study is to measure one specific "experience" posited to be a direct result of Age Thirty Transition. The "experience" referred to is career appraisal.

Forming "the Dream" is the initial task of the novice phase. The "Dream" is a highly abstract construct. Understanding the Dream as originally conceived requires a degree of intuition because vocabulary alone is insufficient to convey the meaning of the entire concept. The Dream begins to form during the Early Adult Transition. Keep in mind that this period extends from about ages 17 to 22.

In Levinson's words, "As a boy-man begins his entry into adulthood, he imagines exciting possibilities for
his adult life" (1978, p. 93). The Dream has elements of fantasy, aspirations, vague plans, hopes, and unfulfilled desires, etc.

The Dream may take an innumerable variety of forms. For some it is dramatic, such as being the hero in a Super Bowl; while for others it might be seeing themselves as a certain kind of father. In whatever form, the nature of the Dream is such that it inspires and sustains the individual in his quest for its fulfillment. Levinson maintained that "it has the quality of a vision, an imagined possibility that generates excitement and vitality" (1978, p. 91). Almost always the Dream is associated with a man's choice of work. In many instances the men Levinson (1978, p. 94) studied "felt" they should do a certain type of work.

In order for a man to be successful in working out his Dream, it is often very necessary that he have the help of a mentor. Establishing a positive relationship with a mentor is the second common task addressed. Levinson (1978, p. 98) intended the term mentor to mean more than a teacher and advisor or sponsor. Levinson explained: "Mentoring is defined not in terms of formal roles but in terms of the character of the relationship and the functions it serves."

The mentor served as a transitional figure representing a mixture of parent and peer. The most decisive
function of the mentor was to "support and facilitate the realization of the Dream" (1978, p. 98). Levinson elaborated further on the purpose of the mentor:

He fosters the young adult's development by believing in him, sharing the youthful Dream, and giving it his blessing, helping to define the newly emerging self in its newly discovered world, and creating a space in which the young man can work on a reasonably satisfactory life structure that contains the Dream. (1978, p. 99)

The mentoring relationship just portrayed was described in its ideal form. It should be understood that there are many variations of such a relationship, with each having its unique components.

The third "common" task of the novice adult is "forming an occupation." The rationale for Age Thirty Transition is contained in Levinson's enunciation of "forming an occupation"! Understanding the relationship between "forming an occupation" and "Age Thirty Transition" is absolutely essential. If the premises underlying "forming an occupation" are false, then there is very little basis for Age Thirty Transition. Therefore, it was decided that Levinson should be quoted in detail to ensure appreciation of the significance of "forming an occupation." Levinson contended:

It is often assumed that by his early twenties a man normally ought to have a firm occupation and be launched in a well-defined line of work. This assumption is erroneous. It reflects the prevailing view that development is normally complete by the end of adolescence. The imagery of deciding on an occupation is too narrow and
superficial. It is far more useful to speak of forming an occupation, a complex, social-psychological process that extends over the entire novice phase and often beyond. The transformation of interests into occupation is rarely a simple or direct process. A young man may struggle for several years to sort out his multiple interests, to discover what occupations, if any, might serve as a vehicle for living out his interests, and to commit himself to a particular line of work. Once his initial choice of occupation is made, a man must acquire skills, values and credentials. He must develop a more differentiated occupational identity and establish himself within the occupational world. The sequence lasts several years. One of the great paradoxes of human development is that we are required to make crucial choices before we have the knowledge, judgment and self-understanding to choose wisely. Yet, if we put off these choices until we feel truly ready, the delay may produce other and greater costs. This is especially true of the two great choices of early adulthood: occupation and marriage. (1978, pp. 101-102)

In emphasizing that "forming an occupation" was a dynamic, developmental process, Levinson asserted:

For all the (four) occupations, our general finding is this: The process of forming an occupation extends over the novice phase of early adulthood. Not until the end of the Age Thirty Transition does a man complete his occupational novitiate and assume a fully adult status in the work world. (1978, p. 105)

To summarize Levinson's theory to this point, by age 28, a young man has spent approximately 10 years as a novice adult. During the last of his teen years, he began the process of "leaving the nest," both literally and psychologically. Doing so was the result of many decisions which necessitated assuming new roles. Inherent in becoming a young man is the shouldering of greater responsibilities to self and society. The early
twenties are a time of exploration and testing of options. One is actively molding or forming his lifestyle at this time. The mid-twenties are a time of consolidation. The basic life structure has been established. The man is now generally enhancing the foundation stones of his life: occupation and marriage/family. The consequences of those initial decisions, i.e., choice of career, etc., are so significant, though, that the stage has been set for Age Thirty Transition.

Based upon such reasoning, Levinson announced: "It is not possible to form an ideally satisfactory life structure the first time around. For most men, the life structure of the late twenties is incomplete or fragmented" (1978, pp. 82-83). The limitations of the provisional life structure become evident, and the awareness of those limitations ushers in Age Thirty Transition.

The onset of Age Thirty Transition can be likened to arrival at an intersection. A man's perceptions of life are changing. He feels a greater sense of urgency with regard to what he can accomplish. The man will begin to question and reappraise each facet of his life. As described by Levinson:

A voice within the self says: If I am to change my life--if there are things I want to modify or exclude, or things missing I want to add--I must now make a start, for soon it will be too late. (1978, p. 58)
This period is a pivot point: "The Age Thirty Transition is a means of terminating the first adult life structure and of initiating a new structure for completing early adulthood" (1978, p. 50).

It is difficult to establish criteria on the length of the transition or its intensity because:

A transition period comes to an end not when a particular event occurs or when a sequence is completed in one aspect of life. It ends when the tasks of questioning and exploring have lost their urgency . . . . As a transition comes to an end, it is time to make crucial choices, to give those choices meaning and commitment, and to start building a life structure around them. The choices mark the beginning of the next period. They are, in a sense, the major products of the transition. (1978, p. 52)

Levinson acknowledged that there were "exquisite individual variations" in the Age Thirty Transition, but stressed that 62 percent of the sample went through a "moderate or severe crisis" (1978, p. 87).

Levinson struggled to convey the essence of such an experience: One suggestive metaphor for a developmental crisis is a man alone on a body of water trying to get from Island Past to Island Future. He fears that he will not reach the future. He feels that he can move neither forward nor backward, that he is on the verge of drowning. A man may experience himself as swimming alone, or rowing in a leaky boat, or as captain of a luxurious but defective ship caught in a storm. There are wide variations in the nature of the vehicle, the sources of threat and the nature of Past and Future. The critical thing is that the integrity of the enterprise is in serious doubt: he experiences the imminent danger of chaos, dissolution, the loss of the future. (1978, p. 86)

Although the task is subjective, Levinson clarified its objectives: to review and evaluate the past; to decide which aspects of the past to keep and
which to reject; and to consider one's wishes and possibilities for the future. (1978, p. 51)

In his final observations concerning Age Thirty Transition, Levinson proclaimed:

The shift from the end of the Age Thirty Transition to the start of the next period is one of the crucial steps in adult development. At this time a man may make important new choices, or he may reaffirm old choices. If these choices are congruent with his dreams, talents and external possibilities, they provide the basis for a relatively satisfactory life structure. If the choices are poorly made and the new structure seriously flawed, he will pay a heavy price in the next period. Even the best structure has its contradictions and must in time be changed. (p. 59)

**Douglas' research questions.** The secondary purpose of this study was to compare selected findings on deterrents to burnout with the respective findings from the Douglas (1982) study. Following are the Douglas (1982) research questions as they appeared in his study:

1. Do educators who are identified by their administrators as successful, consider themselves successful and free from feelings of burnout?
2. Is there a relationship between various demographic circumstances of educators' work and life settings, and factors cited by them as deterrents to burnout?
3. Are there particular leadership styles, or organizational patterns, under which educators have worked [or do work] that emerge as especially effective deterrents to burnout?
4. What factors have the greatest impact as burnout deterrents?

**Douglas' findings.** A summary of the Douglas (1982) findings is provided. A total of 511 educators responded to the Douglas (1982) Questionnaire. It was determined that 88.46 percent of the educators considered themselves
free of burnout, and 10.96 percent of the successful veteran educators reported feeling burned out. In answering question 2, Douglas said:

a. Older, more experienced, successful educators identify more positively the deterrent value of strong testimony, living Gospel principles, challenging Church callings, high interest in other people, maturation of personality, having a good diet and exercise program, and higher income.

b. Younger, less experienced educators identify the deterrent value of meditation on one's blessings, curriculum improvements, and frequent transfers or assignment changes. (p. 227)

Douglas also concluded that:

The "primary CES assignment" of an educator is a very significant factor in considering what the educators identified to be viable deterrents to burnout. (p. 228)

The findings to question 3 were that:

CES educators reported preferring that their line leaders employ a democratic leadership style in working with them, by an 86.69 percent agreement . . . . CES educators were in even greater accord (96.28 percent) that there is relief from burnout that grows out of being able to express opinions to line leaders in decision-making, policy-setting situations. (Douglas, 1982, p. 224)

In answer to the fourth question on most effective deterrents to burnout, the 10 deterrents ranked in order of preference were:

First: Having a happy marriage
Second: Feeling needed in one's job assignment
Third: Enjoying life, and having a positive attitude
Fourth: Being recognized and appreciated for achievements
Fifth: Living Gospel principles
Sixth: Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
Seventh: Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
Eighth: Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order
Ninth: Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
Tenth: Being interested in other people. (p. 225)

Hypotheses

This study was designed to test the following hypotheses as seen by full-time Church Educational System (CES) educators having 6 to 10 years experience (typically ages 28-33):

1. There will be no significant predictive power in the responses to Section F (which deals with career appraisal) in correctly classifying the burnout status of CES educators, as defined and measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.

2. The demographic factors--(a) age, (b) current level of education, (c) years since last geographical move, (d) geographical distance from line leader, (e) years since last primary CES position change, and (f) size of full-time faculty--will have no significant predictive power in correctly classifying the status of burnout among CES educators, as defined and measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.

Research Questions

It was also the intent of this study to answer the following questions relative to burnout as seen by full-time CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience:
1. What are the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as ranked by the direct response of the educators to Section C of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire?

2. What are the notable differences between the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as perceived by the CES educators who participated in this study and the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout chosen by the subjects of the Douglas study as measured by Section C of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire (which was used in each study)?

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study was limited to educators in the Church Education System (CES) of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in the United States, who had at least six years of service in the CES as of September 1, 1982, and not more than 10 years service as of June 15, 1983. These educators were under the direction of the CES' associate commissioner of education and served in either some area of released-time seminary, institute of religion, special education/seminary or Lamanite seminary.

Besides those educators serving as teachers, this study further included educators serving as central office staff, administrators, coordinators, curriculum writers, and those on special assignment (such as sabbatical leave) having 6 to 10 years experience.
Educators at Brigham Young University (BYU), Ricks College, BYU-Hawaii campus, LDS Business College, or the elementary and secondary schools in foreign lands having 6 to 10 years service were not included in this study.

**Definitions of Terms**

**Area director**—Within a given geographical area, the chief administrative officer of CES is known as the area director. Institute directors and instructors, seminary coordinators, principals, teachers, CES coordinators, and special education personnel are under his direction.

**Burnout**—

A state of fatigue; a frustration brought on by devotion to a cause or relationship that fails to produce the expected results. It may involve a failure or wearing out; becoming exhausted by excessive demands on time, energy, and resources. It may involve feeling locked into a job routine. It involves feeling unappreciated by those served either up or down-line from one's assignment. It is a condition where one's energy and motivation are dissipated at a faster rate than they can be regenerated. It involves feeling powerless to change certain work conditions that seem never to change, and which cause a worker to feel frustrated and worn down. It is a drained psychological condition resulting from disgruntling experiences which foster low morale and impaired productivity. A typical statement from one experiencing burnout is: "Other years I've felt like I'm ready for summer vacation in April, but this year I felt like that in November." (Douglas, 1982)

**Central office staff**—The professional CES educators working in, or out of, the system's administrative offices with headquarters in Salt Lake City, Utah. These educators serve in capacities such as director and/or assistant over personnel, benefits, pre-service, in-service and teacher support services.
CES coordinator--A CES coordinator directs the in-service, and evaluation and administrative functions, of seminary principals and teachers, in particular areas where there are concentrations of released-time seminaries.

Church Education System, The--The Church Education System (CES, the System) is considered that organization of religious education under the direction of the associate commissioner of education of the LDS Church, which includes released-time, early morning, home study, special education, and Lamanite seminaries and institutes of religion. The CES in this study does not include educators employed at Brigham Young University, Ricks College, or the other colleges, secondary and elementary schools operated by the LDS Church.

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, The--A religious organization with five million members worldwide. The headquarters is in Salt Lake City, Utah. It is frequently referred to as the Church or LDS Church.

Institute director--The administrator of an institute of religion adjacent to a particular campus of higher education (typically a university or college). The director is responsible for the teaching activities of institute instructors, staff, and students at a particular institute. Usually the director also has responsibilities as an instructor.

Institute of religion--A program of religious instruction for college members of the LDS Church who are attending institutions other than LDS Church schools.
Generally institutes of religion are found in buildings adjacent to those colleges and universities.

Lamanite—A term in the study which refers to the American Indian of North, South, and Central America, and Polynesians in the Pacific islands.

Mission—Where church membership in a particular area is not large enough to provide the necessary leadership, missions are formed to provide administrative guidance to the members living in that area. Missions are presided over by a mission president and two counselors.

Region—For purposes of ecclesiastical administration, the entire Church has been divided into geographical regions. Regions are usually composed of several stakes, which are comparable to a diocese.

Seminary—A program of religious instruction prepared for and taught to high school age members of the LDS Church. Seminary is operated on a home-study, early morning, or released-time basis depending on the number of LDS youth in a given area.

Seminary coordinator—The coordinator has administrative duties for the early morning, home study, and special education seminary teachers serving in the specific area to which he has been assigned.

Seminary principal—The head administrator of a released-time facility near a secondary school. The principal is responsible for directing the instruction
and activities of the full-time seminary teachers and students in his program. The seminary principal generally has teaching responsibilities, too.

Special education—Religious instruction by CES educators for those who are blind, deaf, mentally handicapped, or physically handicapped. Those committed to or incarcerated in special state or private institutions are also considered to be recipients of special education services.

Stake—A stake is a collection of geographically convenient congregations (known as wards and/or branches) of the LDS Church, and is comparable to a diocese of the Roman Catholic Church. The presiding officers of a stake are the State President and his two counselors.

Ward—The basic ecclesiastical unit of the LDS Church. Several wards and branches (smaller dependent congregations) comprise a stake. A Bishop and two counselors preside over a ward.
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Methods and Procedures

Description of Population

The population of interest consisted of those educators having 6 to 10 years experience in the educational system of the LDS Church because it was assumed that approximately half of the population would be 28-33 years old. According to the "Age Thirty Transition" construct, men 28-33 years old are candidates for career appraisal crisis. The measurement of career appraisal and examining its correlation to burnout were the primary purposes of this study.

The personnel department of the CES determined there were 204 men living in the United States who had 6 to 10 years experience. This study involved no sampling technique as the population of interest and the sample were coterminous.

All of the men, with one exception, were married, and only two of the educators did not have children living at home. Each of the men had obtained at least a bachelor's degree, and previous to being employed by the CES had also completed a special program for the training
of professional religious educators. Ninety-eight percent of the population were Anglo-American.

**Instrumentation**

The instrument used in this study, the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire, was adapted from the instrument first developed for use in the Douglas (1982) study. Copies of both questionnaires can be found in Appendix A. Douglas' instrument, Questionnaire on Deterrents to Burn-Out, was constructed after careful study was made of the existing instruments measuring burnout. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was the primary model on which the Douglas instrument was based. The MBI is one of the instruments most widely used in measuring burnout. Through comparison with the MBI and related instruments used to assess burnout, it was determined that the Douglas questionnaire on deterrents to burnout had content validity; however, no attempt was made to determine concurrent validity with the other instruments measuring burnout.

After approval of content from the central office staff of the CES, Douglas field tested his instrument with 43 CES educators. The field testing indicated that some of the items in the questionnaire were ambiguous. Clarifications were made.

For the purposes of this study, a series of statements dealing with attitudes toward work and career were appended to the Douglas instrument. These twelve items were to measure a man's appraisal of: progression in
his career, degree of satisfaction found in his work, how meaningful his work is, and commitment to his career. The statements were to assess degree of career appraisal "crisis" each man had experienced. The statements dealing with career appraisal were developed with the help of a professional research psychologist and a professor of educational psychology. It was determined that the items dealing with career appraisal had face value and content validity.

Field testing with six CES educators was conducted. No specific tests to determine the reliability of the career appraisal items were conducted.

Procedures

A request to continue research into factors deterring burnout among CES educators, initiated by Douglas (1982), was submitted to the central office staff of the Church Educational System. Permission was granted to survey all CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience using the basic instrument developed by Douglas. It was stipulated that the findings of this study were to be compared (where relevant) with the findings of the Douglas study.

Formative evaluation of the statements dealing with career appraisal was completed. Then final approval of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire was received from the central office staff. After field testing, minor revisions in format and wording were completed.
The CES personnel department provided a complete list of names and addresses for all CES educators meeting the population criteria. The total population living in the United States was comprised of 204 men.

On April 16, 1983, each of the 204 men was sent a questionnaire under cover letter from the associate commissioner of education. Completed questionnaires were to be returned to the Church Office Building in Salt Lake City. At the end of three weeks there had been an 82 percent return.

On May 10, 1983, a postcard was sent to non-respondents encouraging their participation in the survey. Special provision was made to seek feedback via telephone from non-respondents having negative feelings or questions about the survey. A member of the central office staff familiar with the survey provided a telephone number which would give direct access to his office.

Sixteen additional questionnaires were received after the postcard mailing. By the end of May, there had been a 90.1 percent return. Two phone calls were received in which the subjects questioned the confidentiality of the survey. Both subjects expressed the sentiment that if they were candid, their job security might be threatened. After receiving assurances that their responses would be kept anonymous, both men returned their
questionnaires. One of the men attached three type-written pages of grievances that he considered relevant to burnout.

**Data Analysis**

Responses from each valid questionnaire were transferred to IBM answer sheets which were then scanned so the data could be put on tape. The data were analyzed through assistance of personnel at the Center for Statistical Research, Brigham Young University. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used in obtaining the frequency distribution, rankings, cross-tabulations, regression analyses and discriminant analyses necessary to study the findings.

Based upon analysis of the findings of this study, conclusions and recommendations were made.
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Results

All educators having 6 to 10 years experience (typically 28 to 33 years old) in the educational system of the LDS Church were surveyed to determine the relationship between the intensity of career appraisal crisis and the incidence of burnout, as measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire. The relationship among various demographic factors—age, current level of education, etc.—and the incidence of burnout was analyzed. The 10 factors reported as the most effective deterrents to burnout were compared to the respective findings from the Douglas (1982) study.

The survey was conducted among 204 CES educators living in the United States during the late spring of 1983. There were 185 questionnaires returned (90.6 percent). Three were invalid. The data were analyzed at BYU using the SPSS.

Summary of Demographic Data

The initial categories used to define the CES educators who participated in the survey were: years of
service in the CES, current age, current level of education, years since last geographic move, geographical distance from immediate line leader, years since last primary CES position change, size of full-time faculty (including self), frequency of attendance at faculty in-service meetings, marital status, and number of children living at home.

In addition, the categories of current administrative and/or teaching assignment, present calling in the Church, civic or community office held, and income in addition to CES salary were also used to identify the characteristics of the educators surveyed.

**Years of Service in CES**

Thirty-nine respondents (21.4 percent) had served six years. There were 38 educators (20.9 percent) with seven years experience, and 37 men (20.3 percent) having eight years service. Only 16 educators (8.8 percent) reported 10 years of service while 50 respondents (27.5 percent) indicated nine years of service (Table 1).

**Current Age**

The two youngest subjects (1.1 percent) were 28 years old. Six educators (3.3 percent) were 29, sixteen men (8.8 percent) were 30, and fourteen respondents (7.7 percent) were 31. Another seventeen educators
Table 1

Summary of Years of CES Service Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of CES Service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(9.3 percent) were 32. The modal age was 33, with thirty men (16.5 percent) in that category (Table 2).

Ninety-six of the respondents (52.7 percent) were older than 33. No provision was made for individual age categories past age 33. The older educators simply reported their ages. It was determined that the maximum age was 58 (one response, .5 percent), while most of the older educators reported ages in the forties.

Current Level of Education

The most common level of education was a master's degree with 109 educators (59.9 percent) reporting attainment. Of the total respondents, 17 (9.3 percent) had obtained either a Ph.D. or Ed.D. In the category of B.A./B.S., there were 44 (24.2 percent) personnel (Table 3).

Years in Present Geographical Location

Sixteen subjects (8.8 percent) reported only being in their present location for a year, with 45 people (24.7 percent) having lived in the same place for two to three years.

Fifty-two of the educators (28.6 percent) had lived four to five years in the same place. In contrast, there were just 20 respondents (11.0 percent) who indicated
Table 2
Summary of Age Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N %
Table 3

Summary of Current Level of Education Data Reported by Educators of the
Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Levels of Education</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A./B.S.</td>
<td>M.A./M.S.</td>
<td>Ed.D./Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they had been in the same location for eight or more years. Another 46 men (25.3 percent) claimed that it had been six to seven years since their last move (Table 4).

Distance in Miles From Immediate Leader

Almost half of the respondents, 88 (48.4 percent), lived within nine miles of their line leader. With the exception of the 28 respondents (9.9 percent) who lived more than 200 miles from their immediate leader, there was an inverse relationship of miles from line leader to number of respondents in each successive category. Forty educators (22.0 percent) reported being 10-29 miles from their leader, with sixteen men (8.8 percent) 30-49 miles away from their leader, while fifteen (8.2 percent) lived 50-99 miles from their nearest leader, and only four people (2.2 percent) indicated that they were at least 100-199 miles away from their immediate supervisor (Table 5).

Years Since Last CES Position Change

Twenty-five of the 182 respondents, or 13.7 percent, answered that it had been eight or more years since their last position change. Those educators having had one year of experience in their current position numbered 31 (17 percent) as compared to the 49 (26.9 percent)
Table 4

Summary of Years in Present Location Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Present Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Summary of Geographical Distance (Miles) From Immediate Line Leader Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Distance (Miles)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

182 Total
with two to three years since their last position change. There were 32 men who had retained their CES position from four to five years, and an additional 45, or 24.7 percent, of the sample who had held their positions for six to seven years (Table 6).

Size of Faculties

Nearly one-third (60 respondents or 33.0 percent) of the men worked alone, while another third of the men (67 respondents or 34.0 percent) worked in facilities having five or more educators. Only 16 educators, or 8.8 percent, were in the three-man facilities, with 19 men, or 10.4 percent, in two-man facilities and 13.7 percent, or 25 men, working in faculties of four (Table 7).

Frequency of Attendance at Faculty In-service Meetings

A majority of the educators attended in-service either twice a month (55 men, 30.2 percent) or monthly (69 respondents, 37.9 percent). Only three educators, or 1.6 percent, claimed no attendance at in-service meetings, with a few more men (5 respondents, 2.7 percent) attending once a year. Five others (2.7 percent) also reported twice yearly attendance. Eighteen of the men (9.9 percent) were at in-service
Table 6

Summary of Years Since Last CES Position Change Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Since Last CES Position Change</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Summary of Size of Faculty Where Respondent Works (Including Self) Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Faculty</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


quarterly and 16 men (8.8 percent) indicated in-service attendance every other month (Table 8).

Marital Status

None of the sample were divorced or widowers. One was single and 99.5 percent or 181, were married (Table 9).

Number of Children Living at Home

Of the 182 respondents, there were only 2, or 1.1 percent, having no children at home. The most common response indicated that 49 educators (26.9 percent) had four children at home. Seven respondents, or 3.8 percent, had one child home in contrast to 10 men (5.5 percent) with seven or more children at home. Fifteen, or 8.2 percent, of those surveyed had two children living at home and another 17.0 percent, or 31 educators, reported three children each in their homes. The second largest category of children at home consisted of the 46 educators (25.3 percent) who indicated five children per household (Table 10).

Primary Professional Assignment

Many professional assignments in the Church Education System involve a combination of administrative and teaching assignments. Most of the educators surveyed, therefore, indicated positions held in both categories (Table 11).
Table 8
Summary of Frequency of Attendance at Faculty In-service Meetings Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Attendance</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once/Yr.</th>
<th>Twice/Yr.</th>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Bi-monthly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Twice/Mo.</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9

Summary of Marital Status Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Widowed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10
Summary of Number of Children Living at Home Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children Living at Home</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative positions. Out of the entire sample, there were 56 educators, or 30.8 percent, with no administrative responsibilities. The typical administrative position involved released-time seminary with 78 men, or 47.9 percent, of the sample having administrative duties. Then 16 educators (8.8 percent) reported holding an administrative position associated with an Institute of Religion (Table 11).

There was one (.5 percent) administrator over a Lamanite seminary, two (1.1 percent) over Home-Study, two (1.1 percent) having Special Education administrative assignments, two (1.1 percent) who indicated administrative duties involving curriculum, and one (.5 percent) administrator associated with Teacher Support services. An additional 12 educators (6.6 percent) had administrative assignments related to Early Morning Seminary.

Teaching assignments. Almost three-fourths of the sample, 133 men or 73.1 percent, had teaching assignments associated with released-time seminary. An additional 18.1 percent, or 33 men, taught at an Institute of Religion. Three men, or 1.6 percent, of the respondents taught in Lamanite seminaries and two men, or 1.1 percent, had teaching assignments at Special Education seminaries (Table 12).
Table 11
Summary of Current Primary Administrative Position Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Primary Administrative Position</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Study</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Morning</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released-time</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamanite Education</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Morning</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released-time</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamanite Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Current Primary Teaching Assignment Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Primary Teaching Assignment.</th>
<th>Released-time</th>
<th>Lamanite Education</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>3 1.6</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
<td>33 18.1</td>
<td>6 3.3</td>
<td>5 2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present Positions (Callings) in the LDS Church Held by Respondents

The position most commonly held was member of a bishopric, with 40 men (27.0 percent) reporting that calling. In contrast, only one man (.5 percent) held the office of Patriarch. There were 34 men (18.7 percent) who served as advisors or in quorum presidencies. The position of Stake High Council Representative was held by 31 men (17.0 percent), and 30 men reported they were either priesthood teachers or teachers in an auxiliary.

Ten of the respondents (5.5 percent) were stake missionaries while five others (2.7 percent) held a position on a stake board.

Seven men (3.8 percent) indicated they were in stake presidencies or working on general boards (a special committee called to oversee a particular project). There were 17 men (9.3 percent) who reported holding a position not covered by one of the available categories, and seven men (3.8 percent) who didn't respond to the question (Table 13).

Public Office Held or Involvement in Community Affairs

Slightly more than one-fourth of the sample, 52 men, or 28.6 percent, were officers in the Boy Scouts of America. There were two educators, or 1.1 percent, who
Table 13

Summary of Present Church "Callings" (Positions) Held by Respondents Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Church &quot;Callings&quot; (Positions) Held</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Board/Regional Rep./Stake Pres.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop/Bishop's Stake Pres.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake High Council Advisor</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorum Presidency, Stake Quorum Board</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary, Priesthood, Stake Board</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stake Patriarch, Teacher, Member, Missionary</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0
served on a school board, one educator (.5 percent) in state government, one man (.5 percent) with a position in county government, and one person (.5 percent) who acted as a PTA officer.

Seventy-four educators (40.7 percent) indicated no involvement in civic affairs, and an additional 39 educators (21.4 percent) gave no response (Table 14).

**Income in Addition to CES Salary**

Of 182 respondents, there were 148 (81.3 percent) who indicated they had additional income. There were 33 men (18.1 percent) who reported no income besides their CES salary (Table 15).

Ten men (5.5 percent) had from $1-$500 in additional income; 40 men (22.0 percent) reported $501-$2,000 extra income; 35 others (19.2 percent) had from $2,001-$3,500 in extra earnings; while 23 men (12.6 percent) claimed $3,501-$5,000 in additional income, and 40 men (22 percent) reported over $5,000 in outside income (Table 16).

Property, investments, or inheritance were the source of income for seven men (3.8 percent). Sixty-four men (35.2 percent) reported having a second job. There were 35 (19.2 percent) who indicated they had summer jobs. Eighteen educators (9.9 percent) had working spouses, and 17 others (9.3 percent) reported
Table 14

Summary of Holding Office in Community Government or Community Affairs Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holding Office in Community Government or Community Affairs</th>
<th>State Government</th>
<th>County Government</th>
<th>City Government</th>
<th>School Board</th>
<th>PTA Officer</th>
<th>Scouting Officer</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 .5</td>
<td>1 .5</td>
<td>1 .5</td>
<td>2 .1</td>
<td>1 .5</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>182.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 15
Summary of Income in Addition to CES Salary Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Income</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

Summary of Amount of Additional Income Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Additional Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1-500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N501-2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2001-3500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3501-5000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sources of income not covered by the available categories (Table 17).

The Hypotheses Which This Study Was Designed to Answer

All CES educators living in the United States with 6 to 10 years experience (typically 28-33 years old) were mailed a questionnaire designed to answer the following hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant relationship between the items measuring career appraisal crisis and the reported status of burnout among CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience as measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.

2. There will be no significant relationship between the status of reported burnout among CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience and the following demographic factors:
   a. current age
   b. current level of education
   c. years since last geographical move
   d. geographical distance from line leader
   e. years since last primary CES position change
   f. size of full-time faculty (including self)
as measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.
Table 17

Summary of Sources of Additional Income Data Reported by Educators of the Church Educational System of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Additional Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Investments, Inheritance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Spouse</td>
<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>Other</td>
<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>No Response</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses Related to Hypothesis One

Before the relationship between the items measuring career appraisal crisis and the reported status of burnout could be examined, it was necessary to determine the actual incidence of burnout. The relationship between age and incidence of burnout was also examined.

After being presented with a definition of burnout relevant to their circumstances, the CES educators were asked to indicate one of four responses which best reported their current status in regards to burnout. It was possible to "strongly disagree," "disagree," "agree," or "strongly agree" with the following statement: "I'd say I feel burned out in my present assignment."

There were 73 educators (40.1 percent) who strongly disagreed they were burned out, with 74 educators (40.7 percent) disagreeing they were burned out. Twenty-three (13.1 percent) of the respondents agreed they were burned out, while six educators (3.4 percent) strongly agreed they were burned out in their current assignments.

Crosstabulation of the response to burnout with the given age categories (27 or younger, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, or older) was completed, but there were not sufficient subjects per cell to permit statistically significant analysis. Eventually two groups based on age were used: those men 28-33 years old and those men older than 33 (34-58 years old). Also, the "agree"
and "strongly agree" response categories were combined. Table 18 shows the crosstabulation of reported burnout and age groups after the different categories were collapsed, as previously described.

The number of younger educators who strongly disagreed they were burned out was 33 men, or 38.82 percent, and was close to the number of older educators, 40 men or 41.66 percent, who strongly disagreed they were burned out. There were 30 educators (35.29 percent) in the younger age group who disagreed about being burned out as compared to 43 older educators (44.79 percent) who disagreed they were burned out.

Among the CES educators who agreed/strongly agreed they were burned out, there were 19 men, or 22.35 percent, in the younger age group. In the older age group, there were 10 educators or 10.42 percent who agreed/strongly agreed they were burned out.

A test of goodness of fit determined that the incidence (percent) of burnout in the younger (28-33) age group was not statistically more significant than the incidence of burnout among the older (34-58) educators.

Of the 12 items used to measure career appraisal crisis, six were chosen as variables in a discriminate analysis to determine their value as predictors of burnout. An analysis of each group's mean response to
Table 18
Crosstabulation of Age Groups With Reported Status of Burnout
Among CES Educators With 6 to 10 Years Experience, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement: &quot;I'd say I feel burned out in my present CES assignment&quot;</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28-33</td>
<td>34-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree/strongly agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>99.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
each of the six predictor variables was made to determine the influence of each variable in predicting potential burnout victims. The relative influence (weight) of each predictor variable was designated by an "F" value which was equivalent to the Wilks' Lambda of each variable. The results of the analysis were then used to form a classification rule for predicting potential burnout candidates, based upon response to the six career appraisal statements (predictors). The results of the discriminant analysis are found in Tables 19 and 20.

The six items used as predictor variables were:

1. I often wonder if I am making progress in my career.
2. I have never really questioned my choice of a career in the CES.
3. I feel like I am progressing in my career.
4. Working in the CES has always been a source of great personal satisfaction to me.
5. I wonder if I am really accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work.
6. If it were possible, I would change careers.

Answers were reported on a Likert scale of 1-5 with 1 indicating "does not describe at all" through 5 which "describes exactly."

The sixth item, "If it were possible I would change careers," was found to be the best predictor of burnout with an "F" value (or Wilks' Lambda) of 64.114 at "P" (level of significance) .0000. The mean response of the group to item six was 2.897, while 1.524 was the mean response to that item by the group not burned out.
Table 19
Discriminate Analysis of Six Statements Measuring Career Appraisal Crisis and Self-Reported Status of Burnout Among 6 to 10 Year CES Educators, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Response (Group Means)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Burned Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does Not Describe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes Exactly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burned Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does Not Describe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes Exactly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it were possible I would change careers.</td>
<td>1.524</td>
<td>2.897</td>
<td>64.114</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often wonder if I am making progress in my career.</td>
<td>2.545</td>
<td>4.034</td>
<td>38.402</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I am progressing in my career.</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>3.966</td>
<td>3.566</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never really questioned my choice of a career in the CES.</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td>4.483</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wonder if I am really accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work.</td>
<td>1.664</td>
<td>2.482</td>
<td>1.441</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in the CES has always been a source of great personal satisfaction to me.</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
Results of Classification Rule Formulated Through Discriminant Analysis of Responses Among CES Educators to Their Burnout States and Responses to Six Career Appraisal Items, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Classification Predicted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Burned Out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not burned out</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned out</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungrouped</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item number one, "I often wonder if I am making progress in my career," was also found to have significant value ("F" value of 38.402) as a predictor of burnout. For those who reported no burnout, the mean response was 2.545, in contrast to the group mean of 4.034 for the burned out group.

When the influence of items one and six was controlled for, the influence of the other four items as predictors of burnout was almost negligible.

Application of the classification rule (procedure) indicated that based upon each educator's response to the six career appraisal items, 121 (84.6 percent) of the educators not burned out were classified correctly. Twenty-three (79.3 percent) of the educators who reported burnout were classified correctly. So, 83.72 percent of the grouped educators were correctly classified.

Multiple regression was also used to determine the correlation between burnout and the six predictor variables (career appraisal items) used in the discriminate analysis. Table 21 shows the results. It was found that the t-ratio for item six, "If it were possible I would change careers," was 4.55. With 157 degrees of freedom, any value above 1.96 at alpha .05 was significant. The t-ratio for the first item, "I often wonder if I am making progress in my career," was 4.19, and the third item, "I feel like I am progressing
Table 21

Multiple Regression Involving Status of Burnout Among CES Educators and Their Response to Six Career Appraisal Items on the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire, 1983*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I often wonder if I am making progress in my career.</td>
<td>0.18486</td>
<td>0.04408</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have never really questioned my choice of a career in the CES.</td>
<td>-0.12214</td>
<td>0.04127</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel like I am progressing in my career.</td>
<td>0.11781</td>
<td>0.05598</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working in the CES has always been a source of great personal satisfaction to me.</td>
<td>0.4639</td>
<td>0.06697</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I wonder if I am really accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work.</td>
<td>0.11042</td>
<td>0.05934</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If it were possible, I would change careers.</td>
<td>0.27398</td>
<td>0.06020</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The standard deviation of Y about the regression line was S = 0.6138, with (164.7) = 157 degrees of freedom. r-squared = 42.9. r-squared = 40.7 after adjusted for df.
in my career," had a t-ratio of 2.10, while a t-ratio
of -2.96 was found for item number two, "I have never
really questioned my choice of a career in the CES."
In addition, r-squared was calculated to be 40.7
percent.

Through analysis of variance, it was determined
that of the sum of squares total 103.5305, 59.1480 was
the sum of squares unexplained (error) while 44.3825
was the sum of squares explained (due to regression). The
mean square of the unexplained variance was 0.3767,
with 7.3971 the mean square of the explained variance.
The resulting F ratio was 19.637. At alpha .05, any
value above 2.21 was significant.

The contribution from each of the six independent
variables to the sum of squares explained, 44.3825, was
25.6629 for variable (item) one, "I often wonder if I
am making progress in my career"; 0.6736 for variable
two, "I have never really questioned my choice of a
career in the CES"; 4.8814 for variable three, "I feel
like I am progressing in my career"; 2.1479 for the
fourth variable, "Working in the CES has always been a
source of great personal satisfaction to me"; 3.2140 for
variable number five, "I wonder if I am really
accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work"; and 7.8026
for the sixth variable, "If it were possible I would
change careers."
The findings of the discriminant analysis and the regression analysis provide evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there would be no significant predictive power in the items measuring career appraisal in correctly classifying the status of burnout among CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience.

Responses Related to Hypothesis Two

The responses of the burned out group versus the not burned out group of CES educators to six categories of demographic data were analyzed to determine if significant relationships existed.

The demographic categories used in the discriminant analysis were:

1. current age in years
2. current level of education
3. years since last geographical move
4. geographical distance from immediate line leader
5. years since last primary CES position change
6. size of full-time faculty (including self).

The results of that analysis are found in Table 22.

The mean age of the group not burned out was 5.95 as compared to the mean age of 5.03 for the burned out group of CES educators, with the variable current age receiving an "F" value of 8.117 at alpha .0049. The mean years since last primary CES position change was
Table 22

Discriminate Analysis of Reported Burnout Among CES Educators and Six Demographic Variables, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Response (Group Means)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Burned Out No. 141</td>
<td>Burned Out No. 29</td>
<td>F Value</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age (in years)</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>8.117</td>
<td>.0049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since last primary CES position change</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>6.497</td>
<td>.0019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance form immediate line leader</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>5.758</td>
<td>.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since last geographical move</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>4.601</td>
<td>.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of faculty</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current level of education</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not calculated.
2.45 for the burned out group while 1.80 years was the mean for those educators not burned out (F value of 6.497 and P of .0019). The mean distance from immediate line leader was .62 for burned out CES educators, in contrast to the mean of 1.33 for those not burned out (with P of .0009 and F value of 5.758). For years since last geographical move, the burned out educators had a mean of 2.10 and the educators not burned out had a mean of 1.90 (at P of .0015 and F value of 4.601). The differences in mean responses to the variable current level of education and size of faculty were not significant.

The classification rule produced by the analysis correctly classified 69.77 percent of the educators in the group (burned out or not burned out) that they belonged to based upon their reported burnout status. The classification results are found in Table 23. According to their responses in the six demographic categories, 102 CES educators (71.3 percent) who reported no feelings of burnout were classified correctly and 18 (62.1 percent) of the burned out educators were correctly classified in the burned out group.

Multiple regression was used to determine the strength of the relationship between reported burnout and the six demographic categories used as predictors of
Table 23

Results of the Classification Role Formulated by Discriminate Analysis of Responses Among CES Educators to Their Burnout Status and Six Demographic Variables, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Classification Predicted</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Burned Out</td>
<td>Burned Out</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not burned out</td>
<td>102 71.3</td>
<td>41 28.7</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned out</td>
<td>11 37.9</td>
<td>18 62.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ungrouped</td>
<td>3 50.0</td>
<td>3 50.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
burnout. The results are found in Table 24. Each of
the six independent variables (demographic character-
istics) received the following weights (coefficients)
according to their contribution to the dependent variable
(burnout): (1) current age, -0.05560; (2) current
level of education, 0.03275; (3) years since last
geographical move, -0.04344; (4) geographical distance
from line leader, -0.09280; (5) years since last primary
CES position change, 0.09312; (6) size of faculty,
-0.03867.

The $t$-ratio for variable one was -1.36; 0.43
for variable two; -0.77 for the third variable; -2.06
for variable four; 1.89 for the fifth variable and the
sixth variable had a $t$-ratio of -0.89. To be significant
at the .05 level with 157 degrees of freedom, the value
of the $t$-ratio had to be greater than 1.96. Initially,
$R^2$ was calculated to be 6.9 percent, but after
adjustment for degrees of freedom, it was 3.3 percent.

Through analysis of variance, it was found that for
the sum of squares total, 103.5305, only 7.1453 was the
sum of squares explained (due to regression) and 96.3852
was the residual (unexplained) sum of squares. In
breaking down the variance (sum of squares explained =
7.1453) attributed to the independent variables, current
age (variable one) accounted for 2.0277, with current
level of education (variable two) being 0.0163; years
Table 24
Analysis Using Multiple Regression of Reported Burnout in CES Educators and Relationships Among Six Demographic Characteristics, 1983*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Current age</td>
<td>-0.05560</td>
<td>0.04078</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Current level of education</td>
<td>0.03275</td>
<td>0.07573</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Years since last geographical move</td>
<td>-0.04344</td>
<td>0.05639</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Geographical distance from line leader</td>
<td>-0.09280</td>
<td>0.04505</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Years since last primary CES position change</td>
<td>0.09312</td>
<td>0.04919</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Size of full-time faculty (including self)</td>
<td>-0.03867</td>
<td>0.04347</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The standard deviation of Y about the regression line was S=0.7835, with (164.7) = 157 degrees of freedom. r-squared = 6.9 percent. r-squared = 3.3 after adjustment for df.
since last geographical move (variable three) 0.0283; geographical distance from line leader (variable four) 2.1276; years since last primary CES position change (variable five) 2.4595, and the size of full-time faculty, including self (variable six), being 0.4859.

The mean square of the residual or unexplained variance was 0.6139 and the mean square of the variance due to regression was 1.909 which resulted in an F ratio of 3.109. At alpha .05, the critical value was 2.21. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected based upon the findings presented above.

The Research Questions Which This Study Was Designed to Answer

Besides seeking to test the two hypotheses previously addressed, it was also the intent of this study to answer the following questions relative to burnout as seen by full-time CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience:

1. What are the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as ranked by direct response of CES educators to Section C of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire?

2. What are the notable differences between the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as perceived (ranked) by the CES educators who participated in this study and the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout, as chosen by the CES educators who participated in the Douglas study?
Responses Related to the First Research Question

The express purpose for Section C in the questionnaire was to learn which of the 28 cited deterrents to burnout were considered to be of greatest significance to the CES educators. Each respondent was asked to rank in descending order the three factors he considered most important in deterring burnout. The first choices each received a weighted value of three, while all second choices were given the weighted value of two, and the weighted value of one was given to each third choice. The same procedure was used in the Douglas study. Table 25 shows the results of the ranking.

Being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments was ranked as the number one deterrent, with a weighted value of 127. Having a happy marriage was ranked as the second deterrent to burnout and had a weighted value of 122. Enjoying life and having a positive, optimistic attitude was ranked third with a weighted value of 105. Feeling needed in one's job assignment was determined to be the fourth most effective deterrent to burnout (weighted value of 96). The fifth deterrent, living Gospel principles, had a weighted value of 69. A positive relationship with one's line leader was ranked sixth with a weighted value of 57. Feeling challenged in one's CES job assignment and hobbies/avocations away from the job each received a weighted
Table 25
Rank Order of Factors Deterring Burnout, as Reported by 6 to 10 Year CES Educators, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
<th>Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Being recognized &amp; appreciated</td>
<td>25 14.4</td>
<td>19 11.0</td>
<td>14 8.2</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A happy marriage</td>
<td>25 14.4</td>
<td>17 9.8</td>
<td>13 7.6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Those who enjoy life &amp; have positive, optimistic attitudes</td>
<td>26 14.9</td>
<td>11 6.4</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Feeling needed in one's CES assignment</td>
<td>13 7.5</td>
<td>23 13.3</td>
<td>11 6.5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Living Gospel principles, prayer, fasting</td>
<td>16 9.2</td>
<td>8 4.6</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A positive relationship with one's line leader</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>13 7.5</td>
<td>16 9.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feeling challenged in one's CES job</td>
<td>9 5.2</td>
<td>6 3.5</td>
<td>6 3.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hobbies &amp; avocation away from job</td>
<td>7 4.0</td>
<td>6 3.5</td>
<td>12 7.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Being able to express opinions to line leaders</td>
<td>8 4.6</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>12 7.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Keeping priorities in order: (a) family . . .</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>10 5.8</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A consistent program of diet &amp; exercise</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
<td>10 5.8</td>
<td>10 5.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frequent (3-5 yrs.) transfers &amp; changes</td>
<td>6 3.4</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Those most interested in other people</td>
<td>4 2.3</td>
<td>9 5.2</td>
<td>3 1.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Faculty in-service improvements</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>9 5.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Those with higher total income less burnout</td>
<td>5 2.9</td>
<td>4 2.2</td>
<td>4 2.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Success in the home</td>
<td>2 1.1</td>
<td>8 4.6</td>
<td>3 1.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Importance in Deterring</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Weighted Value</th>
<th>Composite Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st N %</td>
<td>2nd N %</td>
<td>3rd N %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Curriculum improvements help avoid burnout</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>3 1.7</td>
<td>9 5.3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Maturation of personality a factor in deterring</td>
<td>2 11</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>6 3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A democratic leadership style by line leader</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>6 3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Merit pay scale to reward outstanding educators</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>6 3.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Altering job descriptions within assignments</td>
<td>2 11</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>4 2.4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A challenging Church assignment</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Periodic meditation about one's blessing</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>6 2 1.2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burnout closely related to testimony</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 1.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Laissez-faire leadership style contributes</td>
<td>2 11</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Burnout more apt to appear over age 35</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Involvement in civic &amp; community affairs</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. An authoritarian leadership style</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
value of 45 and thus were ranked 7.5. Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that affect working conditions was the ninth deterrent, having a weighted value of 42. The tenth most effective deterrent to burnout on the job was keeping priorities in order, namely, (a) family, (b) Church, and (c) professional work, with a weighted value of 40.

To check on the validity of the findings from Section C of the questionnaire, the mean response to each deterrent as it was initially presented to the CES educators in Section B was calculated. The 28 mean scores were then arranged in order from highest to lowest. Those findings are in Table 26.

Item 17, "Being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments and achievements deters burnout" was ranked as the most effective deterrent with a mean score of 2.327. The second most effective deterrent was item 1, "Those who enjoy life and have positive, optimistic attitudes toward life are less likely to evidence signs of burnout," which had a mean response of 2.270. "Feeling needed in one's CES assignment helps prevent feelings of burnout," item 16, had a mean response of 2.231 and was ranked third. With a mean of 2.220, item 18, "A positive relationship with one's line leader is a deterrent to burnout," was the fourth deterrent.
Table 26

Ranking of Mean Response for Each of the 28 Factors Cited as Deterrents to Burnout in Section B of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deterrents to Burnout</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Being recognized &amp; appreciated for one's accomplishments &amp; achievements deters burnout</td>
<td>2.327</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Those who enjoy life and have positive attitudes toward life are less likely to evidence signs of burnout.</td>
<td>2.270</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Feeling needed in one's CES assignment helps prevent feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>2.231</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A positive relationship with line leader is a deterrent to burnout.</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Those who have a consistent program of good diet &amp; exercise are less apt to have feelings of burnout on the job.</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that affect working conditions acts as a deterrent to burnout for the worker.</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A happy marriage is a deterrent to burnout.</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hobbies &amp; avocations away from the job are deterrents to burnout on the job.</td>
<td>2.066</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A democratic leadership style on the part of a line leader serve to deter burnout in those working under his direction.</td>
<td>1.916</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterrents to Burnout</td>
<td>Mean Response</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Periodic meditation about one's blessings can prove to help prevent job burnout.</td>
<td>1.905</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Those who feel challenged in their CES job assignment are less apt to show signs of burnout.</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Burnout on the job can be deterred if one feels success in the home.</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Living Gospel principles, i.e., prayer, scripture study, fasting, service, etc., will deter burnout.</td>
<td>1.844</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If one keeps his priorities in order, namely (a) family, (b) Church, and (c) professional work, he is more likely to curb his feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>1.819</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Faculty in-service improvements have been instrumental in deterring educator burnout on the job.</td>
<td>1.817</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Curriculum improvements made by the System are factors helping educators avoid job burnout.</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Burnout is more apt to appear in workers over 35 years old, than in workers under 35 years of age.</td>
<td>1.656</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Those who are most interested in other people are least likely to show signs of burnout.</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Maturation of personality appears to be a factor in curbing job burnout.</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deterrents to Burnout</th>
<th>Mean Response</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Frequent (each 3 to 5 years) transfers &amp; changes in assignment are deterrents to burnout.</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Those with higher total incomes will show less signs of burnout than will those with lower incomes.</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Having a challenging Church assignment where one feels needed is a deterrent to feeling burned out on one's job.</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Being involved in community and civic affairs off the job prevents one from feeling burnout on the job.</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Altering job descriptions within existing CES assignments will prevent feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Some sort of merit pay scale to reward the outstanding educator will serve as a deterrent to burnout.</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. A laissez-faire leadership style on the part of a line leader contributes to a follower being able to curb feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One's degree of burnout is closely related to one's strength of testimony of the Gospel.</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. An authoritarian leadership style on the part of a line leader acts as a deterrent to burnout in the followers.</td>
<td>0.555</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second item in Section B, "Those who have a consistent program of good diet and exercise are less apt to have feelings of burnout on the job," was ranked fifth with a mean score of 2.200. Item 22, "Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that affect working conditions acts as a deterrent to burnout for the worker" and item 15, "A happy marriage is a deterrent to burnout," both had a mean score of 2.177 and were therefore ranked 6.5. "Hobbies and avocations away from the job are deterrents to burnout on the job," item 13, had a mean score of 2.066 and was the eighth most effective deterrent. Item 20, "A democratic leadership style on the part of a line leader serves to deter burnout in those working under his direction," was ranked ninth with a mean response of 1.916. The tenth most effective deterrent, "Periodic meditation about one's blessings can prove to help prevent job burnout," item 23, had a mean score of 1.905.

The "mean" response procedure, used as an alternative method for identifying the 10 factors considered most significant in deterring burnout, was in agreement with seven of the 10 factors chosen as the best deterrents to burnout through the "weighted" response procedure.
Responses Related to Research Question Two

In order to observe notable differences between the 10 factors ranked as the most effective deterrents to burnout in the Douglas study and those 10 factors ranked most effective in this study (as determined by the "weighted" response procedure employed in both studies), the appropriate findings are listed below.

The 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as found in the Douglas (1982, pp. 225, 226) study were:

First: Having a happy marriage
Second: Feeling needed in one's job assignment
Third: Enjoying life, and having a positive attitude
Fourth: Being recognized and appreciated for achievements
Fifth: Living Gospel principles
Sixth: Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
Seventh: Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
Eighth: Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order
Ninth: Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
Tenth: Being interested in other people.

The 10 factors the CES educators in this study considered most effective in deterring burnout were:
First: Being recognized and appreciated for achievements.
Second: Having a marriage
Third: Enjoying life, and having a positive attitude
Fourth: Feeling needed in one's job assignment
Fifth: Living Gospel principles
Sixth: Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
Seventh: Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
Seventh: Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
Ninth: Being able to express opinions to one's line leader
Tenth: Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order.

The factor which ranked tenth in the Douglas study, "Being interested in other people," was not among the 10 factors chosen as most significant deterrents to burnout by the CES educators in this study. "Being able to express opinions to one's line leader," the factor ranked ninth as a deterrent to burnout in this study, was not ranked in the Douglas study as one of the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout. Otherwise, the results of the two rankings were remarkably similar.
Additional Findings

Some of the results from specific sections of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire not previously examined in detail are presented hereafter.

Section B

Examination of the responses to each of the 28 factors cited as deterrents to burnout, which were on frequency distribution charts, revealed several factors worth noting. The responses to each of the 28 items found in Section B were reported in Table 27 as percentages of respondents who either strongly disagree(d)/disagree(d) or who strongly agree(d)/agree(d) that the appropriate factor was a deterrent to burnout.

One hundred seventy-three (96.1 percent) of the respondents indicated that they strongly agree(d)/agree(d) with item 17, "being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments and achievements deters burnout."

Furthermore, there were 94.4 percent (170 men) who strongly agree(d)/agree(d) with item 22, "Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that affect working conditions acts as a deterrent to burnout for the worker."

The responses to items 16 and 18 were nearly identical as 92.7 percent (164 men) of the subjects
Table 27
Response to Section B of Douglas/Allred Questionnaire by 6 to 10 Year CES Educators, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Deterring Burnout</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Those who enjoy life and have positive, optimistic attitudes toward life are less likely to evidence signs of burnout.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>89.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Those who have a consistent program of good diet &amp; exercise are less apt to have feelings of burnout on the job.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One's degree of burnout is closely related to one's strength of testimony of the Gospel.</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Those who are most interested in other people are least likely to show signs of burnout.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Living Gospel principles, i.e., prayer, scripture study, fasting, service, etc., will deter burnout.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Those who feel challenged in their CES job assignment are less apt to show signs of burnout.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frequent (each 3 to 5 years) transfers &amp; changes in assignment are deterrents to burnout.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Altering job descriptions within existing CES assignments will prevent feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Those with higher total incomes will show less signs of burnout than will those with lower incomes.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Having a challenging Church assignment where one feels needed is a deterrent to feeling burned out on one's job.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors Deterring Burnout</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree/ Disagree</td>
<td>Agree/ Strongly Agree</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If one keeps his priorities in order, namely, (a) family, (b) Church, and (c) professional work, he is more likely to curb his feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Burnout on the job can be deterred if one feels success in the home.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hobbies &amp; avocations away from the job are deterrents to burnout on the job.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Being involved in community &amp; civic affairs off the job prevents one from feeling burnout on the job.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A happy marriage is a deterrent to burnout.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Feeling needed in one's CES assignment helps prevent feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Being recognized &amp; appreciated for one's accomplishments &amp; achievements deters burnout.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A positive relationship with one's line leader is a deterrent to burnout.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. An authoritarian leadership style on the part of a line leader acts as a deterrent to burnout in the followers.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A democratic leadership style on the part of a line leader serves to deter burnout in those working under his direction.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. A laissez-faire leadership style on the part of a line leader contributes to a follower being able to curb feelings of burnout.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors Deterring Burnout</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree/Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that affect working conditions acts as a deterrent to burnout for the worker.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Periodic meditation about one's blessings can prove to help prevent job burnout.</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Curriculum improvements made by the System are factors helping educators avoid job burnout.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Faculty in-service improvements have been instrumental in deterring educator burnout on the job.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Some sort of merit pay scale to reward the outstanding educator will serve as a deterrent to burnout.</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Burnout is more apt to appear in workers over 35 years old, than in workers under 35 years of age.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Maturation of personality appears to be a factor in curbing job burnout.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strongly agree(d)/agree(d) that "Feeling needed in one's CES assignment helps prevent feelings of burnout" and 92.3 percent (168 men) strongly agree(d)/agree(d) that "A positive relationship with one's line leader is a deterrent to burnout."

The most nearly unanimous response, though, was to item 19, "An authoritarian leadership style on the part of a line leader acts as a deterrent to burnout in the followers," where 97.2 percent of the educators (175 men) strongly disagree(d)/disagree(d).

Section F

The responses to Section F, the battery of statements dealing with career appraisal crisis, are found in Table 28. There were 114 educators, 64.4 percent, who strongly agreed that "most men go through times when they feel strongly that something is not quite right with their life"; however, only 83 educators, 47.2 percent, strongly agreed that "around age thirty many men seriously question whether they are achieving their career goals." Then, when asked to indicate whether or not "I know men my age in CES who are questioning their choice of careers," there were 109 educators, 61.3 percent, who strongly agreed.
### Table 28
Response to Section F of Douglas/Allred Questionnaire by 6 to 10 Year CES Educators, 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Assessing Career Appraisal Crisis</th>
<th>Does Not Describe</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>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</td>
<td>N%</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Most men go through times when they feel strongly that something is not quite right with their life.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Around age thirty many men seriously question whether they are achieving their career goals.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know men my age in CES who are questioning their choice of careers.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I often wonder if I am making progress in my career.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have never really questioned my choice of a career in the CES.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel like I am progressing in my career.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working in the CES has always been a source of great personal satisfaction to me.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wonder if I am really accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are other careers I could probably enjoy just as much as working in the CES.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If it were possible I would change careers.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. By about age thirty-five it is probably too late for a man to be changing careers.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Those who question how meaningful their work is are most likely to burnout.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixty-five respondents, 36.7 percent, clearly indicated that "I often wonder if I am making progress in my career." Sixty-five other respondents, 36.6 percent, were equally emphatic in their response to "I have never really questioned my choice of a career in the CES." Only a small number of educators (six men or 3.4 percent) strongly disagreed with "I feel like I am progressing in my career."

Of the 177 educators who responded to "I wonder if I am really accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work," only two (1.1 percent) indicated they felt exactly that way. Likewise, only three out of 177 respondents, or 1.7 percent, reported that "working in the CES has always been a source of great personal satisfaction to me" did not describe at all how they felt.

A total of 12 CES educators (6.7 percent) indicated quite definitely that "If it were possible I would change careers."

**Individual Feedback From the Respondents**

In two separate sections of the questionnaire, provision was made for each respondent to make comments.

**Section E.** The instructions for this section were: "Please indicate comments concerning deterrents to burnout in your work with CES that you would like to make, that
you feel are not adequately covered by the question-naire." Eighty-five respondents (46.7 percent) made comments, with a great diversity of observations articulated. Several educators exclaimed, "There is no such thing as burnout!" One institute teacher said, "Burnout is more likely to occur among CES men who fill out burnout surveys or are constantly told about burnout. It may be a self-fulfilling prophecy." The opposite position was also represented by the 36-year-old seminary teacher who commented,

I, like so many others, worry that the time will come when it won't be fun and fulfilling anymore. I hope with all my heart you can find some answers and help. I am not experiencing burnout, but I worry about the future--I love teaching so much.

Teacher-administration relations was the area most often addressed. Eighteen respondents expressed opinions. An educator on sabbatical leave said:

I perceive burnout as being caused by lack of individual attention by CES to what I can do for CES. There is only token interest in the individual teacher, unless he is failing. Related to the lack of sincere interest and the use of token (30 minutes a year) interest, is the lack of individual career planning. A teacher should be able to express what his career goals are and CES should discuss several years of the career at a time instead of 1 yr. at a time. Teaching can be and should be a profession. An employee can feel far away from a career view because of the present personnel methods of CES. When it becomes a job and not a career, problems multiply. Related to the above is the lack of true, 2-way communication in CES. It is very much a top-down system, and unless you are on the top you have few forums to express ideas, suggestions,
problems, successes, etc. Burnout is multiplied because individuals who have concerns cannot talk to each other, and multiply the discontent and discouragement.

A released-time seminary principal/teacher with 10 years experience said:

I feel the greatest cause of frustration in the department is not from low salaries or poor working conditions, but those occasional administrators or ecclesiastical leaders that do not treat the seminary teachers with respect and professional courtesy. It is hard to have your career put in the position of a "quasi-church call"—obedience without question. Our administrator is wonderfully successful in helping the teachers to feel proud of their profession and themselves.

That educator continued:

I believe inservice counseling would be a wise investment of time and money for CES. I'm afraid that some of us fear showing the slightest discontent or frustration, because those feelings might be misconstrued as weak testimony or rebellious attitude. One teacher told me he was afraid to say anything that might "rock the boat" and jeopardize his career.

An institute teacher with eight years experience remarked:

The ever-present awareness that there are always a hundred men who would be happy to take your job (should you voice concerns or dissatisfaction) often leads to a smothering and stifling feeling, and excessive (and unnecessary) loneliness.

There is a built-in dilemma in this work. One's success and permanence is often used as a gauge of his personal spirituality. In short, having one's paycheck so closely tied to his "testimony" is a tad bothersome. I suppose I would rather wrestle with CES occupational hazards than any other. [Appended to the above statement was the following comment.] I sincerely appreciate the interest of the CES administration in dealing with this problem.
Another respondent declared:

Just an emphasis: "We appreciate you, Brother" is not sufficient "recognition and appreciation" from line leaders. When they solicit opinions, utilize special talents of seminary and institute men, are considerate of the needs of the men, when they are fair and honest with subordinates, when they don't try to "wheel and deal" to fill positions--these are some clarifications to the phrase "being recognized and appreciated."

There were 10 responses that focused on the importance of the student-teacher relationship. A typical comment was: "Burnout is caused in the classroom and affects everything else (marriage, other assignments, hobbies, etc.). That's the heart of the matter." Two other related comments by seminary teachers were: "I think most people I have known who have felt burnout hate their students, or dislike them greatly," and "Without a good experience in the classroom most of the time, nothing else will make up for it."

Nine men elaborated on the importance they placed upon a support network in deterring burnout. Half of the nine comments were almost verbatim. The most graphic expression was:

I feel that love and a strong brotherhood among the faculty will help pull anybody through any experience. The opposite will fan the flames of burnout quickly [in]to a raging inferno. I've seen more educators leave education (both public and CES) for that than anything else.
Several of the other comments were summed up by the phrase "single assignments in isolation increase burnout."

The individual's unique character traits were also discussed as factors involved in burnout. As one man put it:

Personality of the teacher plays an important part of whether he will remain creative. The type "A" person who has to have things perfect and tries so hard, can't relax and unwind, tends to have the most trouble . . . .

Another released-time teacher claimed: "Proper expectations whether from self or leaders is key in not burning out." An educator with seven years service in CES explained:

It appears to me that "burnout' stems from inability to achieve desired results in the classroom. As a man strives to reach goals, but finds that his efforts do not bring about the anticipated tangible effects, he becomes frustrated. Extended periods of frustration appear to foment "burnout." Teacher support services can provide innovative and new approaches to a problem, point out unrealistic goals, etc., in a non-threatening way. A man needs an understanding arm around him to meet his own classroom goals and the goals of the department. He does not need threats and indictments.

There were six comments dealing with the need for more preparation time for the teachers and the effect on the teacher due to lack of preparation. In the words of one coordinator:

Time allowed for personal study and research which relates to topics being taught gives a teacher a sense of competence in the classroom which makes his work more satisfying. Being too busy to prepare well makes teaching less fulfilling.
A released-time seminary teacher indicated that after five hours of teaching and 170 students that there was "little time to regenerate self with ideas."

Commitment to work was also a factor that several respondents said would help deter burnout. A seminary principal/teacher advised: "One critical aspect of success in seminary teaching must be a vision of the value of the program in the lives of the youth." Another administrator added: "Attitude is all important. When a person labors necessarily because of obligation, then there is burnout." A nine-year veteran of seminary spoke of the necessity for an educator to feel that his work was "terribly important."

Section G. After responding to the 12 items assessing career appraisal, the subjects were instructed: "Additional feelings or insights concerning experiences involving reassessment/re-evaluation of your career would be appreciated." Fifty-nine educators, 32.4 percent responded. Many of the comments were merely extensions of the initial responses concerning burnout and have been adequately covered. A number of comments were judged to be irrelevant to the topic of career reassessment/re-evaluation.

One theme evident from several comments was that anxiety associated with teaching was inevitable. One man
who had been in CES for eight years said, "I know from listening to many men, burnout is experienced by all."

Another educator echoed that sentiment: "We all feel frustration, failure, and ineffectiveness here and there in doses." A third teacher stated: "Everyone goes through periods of burnout on occasion."

Insights gained through re-evaluation of career were typified by this statement: "I figured out what I wanted and found I already had it. I had been so concerned that I lacked something that I hadn't seen what I already had."

Several of the educators indicated that although they would sometimes get discouraged and question their career, "a sense of destiny" helped them to continue.

One educator's conclusion was that: "At age 52 I am no longer needed for the job I was hired to do."

A few educators reported their exasperation:

How can one ever plan his career with CES? They tell you to plan on staying in the seminary classroom forever; but those who are saying it weren't there very long. Then they talk about "rotation." What a laugh. I'd like to see some of them in the seminary classroom everyday.

One of the major reasons that I've ever considered changing is the lack of specific career measurement guidelines. (Is it a sin to want to be an administrator, aspiring to be a teacher would be "worse," since it's a higher calling. Doesn't the body have need of all parts?) If you're a hand, are you less useful than an eye? But we've said that all hands, feet, knees, ears, etc., have to be first and foremost, eyes (teachers).
Finally, there were affirmations that a career in the CES was completely satisfying:

Teaching the gospel is a joy. I feel like shouting Hallelujah every time I think that I am in the Church Education System!
CHAPTER FOUR
Discussion

A significant number of people in the helping professions have experienced burnout (Cherniss, 1980). In recent years, many studies of burnout among public school educators have been conducted (Kurtz, 1980), and in 1982 a unique study of factors deterring burnout among LDS religious educators was completed (Douglas, 1982). Thus far, though, research has not clearly identified many of the variables which have significant relationships with burnout.

The First Hypothesis

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the predictive power of the items measuring career appraisal in classifying the status of burnout among educators having 6 to 10 years experience (typically 28-33 years old), as defined and measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.

In this study, 147 of the 182 respondents, or 80.7 percent, reported no feelings of burnout, while 29 respondents, or 16.8 percent, indicated they were burned
out. One out of every six men who returned the survey perceived himself as experiencing burnout.

The 10.96 percent incidence of burnout among the CES educators surveyed by Douglas (1982) was somewhat lower than the 16.8 percent incidence of burnout reported in this study. However, the Douglas population consisted only of those CES educators having 10 or more years experience who had been evaluated as being successful, or free of burnout, by their supervisors, whereas in this study all CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience were surveyed.

When the respondents were divided into two age groups, 22 percent of the younger age group (28-33 years old) reported burnout as compared to 10 percent of the older age group (34-58 years old). That younger educators tend to report more burnout was also found by Owens (1980) who indicated that the highest incidence of burnout was among teachers 31-40 years old and the lowest incidence was among teachers over age 50.

Sweeney (1980) reported that teachers between the ages of 25-34 were the least happy of all age groups, and Farber (1982) learned there was a significant correlation between the teachers in their thirties who reported burnout and a weak commitment to work. Both of those factors could help explain why generally it is the younger educators who report more burnout. In addition,
Levinson (1978) found that 62 percent of his subjects reported a moderate to severe career appraisal crisis between the ages of 28-33, and such a crisis experience could impact on those prone to burnout, which would help explain the higher incidence of burnout among younger educators.

Section F of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire dealt with measurement of career appraisal crisis. Through discriminate analysis, the responses of those not burned out, and those who reported burnout to six of the items in Section F were examined to determine the value of those items as predictors of burnout. Item 10 in Section F (variable six in the analysis) and item four (variable one) were found to have the most significant values as predictors of burnout. Item 10 was "If it were possible I would change careers" and item four was "I often wonder if I am making progress in my career." The relative value, as predictors of burnout, that each of the other four variables had was almost negligible.

The findings from analysis of variance of the six career appraisal items (variables) substantiated the results of the discriminate analysis. Items ten and four, respectively, were the sources (variables) that explained most of the variance in burnout due to the six career appraisal variables. Regression analysis established that
40.7 percent of the variability of reported burnout among the CES educators was explained by taking into account the influence of the career appraisal variables.

Section F of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire has practical value, then, as a preliminary means of establishing the notion that there is a significant relationship between the status of burnout and the career appraisal experience among CES educators. Many of the CES educators who reported burnout wondered if they were progressing in their career (variable six) and would change careers if possible (variable one). Awareness of the importance/value placed on "career progression" by some CES educators could be an avenue useful for further research into the career appraisal experience. Section F is, at best, a crude instrument; a much more sensitive instrument is needed to clarify and delimit the factors associated with career appraisal. A greater understanding of the career appraisal experience and how to help men succeed with that "task" could possibly do much to deter burnout.

Schein's (1978) work in organizational behavior offered some explanation of the relationship between burnout and career appraisal. The model of life (see page 23) developed by Schein emphasized the interaction between personal development and career development.
Schein built upon Levinson's theory of adult psychological development. Levinson (1978) posited that throughout life men go through periods of stability followed by periods of transition (change or modification of the life structure), that were age-graded. The periods of transition were characterized as times of more intense stress. Age Thirty Transition, roughly from ages 28-33, was a time during which men engaged in the task of evaluating/appraising their careers. Levinson (1978) claimed that for most men, the career appraisal was actually a crisis. The possibility that a relationship between the burnout experience and the career appraisal experience might exist was the impetus which prompted this study.

Based upon the statistical findings previously cited, there is justification for further investigation into the relationship between personal (adult) development, i.e., "career appraisal," and career development, which failure is probably evidenced by burnout. Furthermore, when consideration is given to many of the respondents' handwritten comments—such as the pleas for the CES administration to participate more adequately in mutual career planning, and the frustrations aired over the lack of administrative direction in career development, then it seems that there is sufficient evidence to warrant further research in this area.
The Second Hypothesis

The demographic factors: (a) current age, (b) current level of education, (c) years since last geographical move, (d) geographical distance from line leader, (e) years since last primary CES position change, and (f) size of full-time faculty (including self), in correctly classifying the status of burnout among CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience, as defined and measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.

As was done in testing the first hypothesis, the six demographic categories (factors) just enumerated were treated as variables in a discriminate analysis of the responses from the burned out group versus the responses of the not burned out group to determine if any significant relationships existed between those who reported burnout and the six demographic factors. The findings of that discriminate analysis were proof that what is statistically significant is not always of practical significance.

Current age (variable a/1), years since last primary CES position change (variable e/5), distance from immediate line leader (variable d/4), and years since last geographical move (variable c/3) were the variables that had some value as predictors of burnout, but their value was quite limited. The results of the classification procedure indicated that 69.77 percent of the educators
were correctly placed into the group (not burned out or burned out) to which they had reported themselves; however only 62.1 percent of the educators who reported burnout were correctly classified.

Through regression analysis, it was determined that just 3.3 percent of the variability of burnout could be explained or accounted for by the six demographic variables.

The most apparent reason why none of the six demographic factors had substantial value as a predictor of burnout is that another variable, or variables (besides the career appraisal variables) had much greater influence upon burnout among the population of CES educators surveyed. Another possible implication from the findings of this study is quite simple: the six demographic variables just do not have significant relationships to burnout.

Research by Fielding (1982), Farber (1982), and McIntyre (1982) has shown that certain personality traits, i.e., an external locus of control and attitudes, were significantly correlated to burnout, whereas the six demographic factors analyzed in this portion of the study were generally related to job setting and external circumstances, with the exception of "current age" and "years since last primary CES position change."
As reported earlier, there is evidence suggesting that the greatest number of educators reporting burnout were under age 40, and that the least burnout is reported after age 50 (Douglas, 1982; Owens, 1980). Teachers ages 31-40 reported higher levels of stress than other age groups (Stress, 1980). Farber (1982) learned that in teachers ages 34-44 there was a strong correlation between reported burnout and weak commitment to work. In his study of special education teachers, McIntyre (1982) found that those teachers between 20-40 scored higher on the subscale of the MBI measuring emotional exhaustion than did teachers 41-50 years old. With age being a factor of some significance in each of the studies reported, there is value in continuing to research the relationship between burnout and its onset.

Of the 10 factors that were ranked as the most effective deterrents to burnout, five were related to the demographic factor "years since last primary CES position change." The factors which relate to years since last primary CES position change are: 1.0 (rank)--Being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments and achievements; 4.0--Feeling needed in one's CES assignment; 6.0--Having a positive relationship with one's line leader; 7.5--Feeling challenged by one's job assignment; and 9.0--Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that affect
working conditions. The relationships among the five factors listed above and years since last primary position change suggest that there could be a pivot point at which time number of years since last position change becomes a significant factor influencing burnout.

It is unfortunate that in this study the demographic variable, primary CES position, was not examined to determine its relationship to burnout. Future research into burnout among CES educators should give more emphasis to primary position.

A composite of the CES educator who reported burnout can be formed through analysis of the mean responses from the two groups of educators (those burned out versus those not burned out) to the six demographic factors examined in the discriminate analysis. Compared to the composite CES educator who was not burned out, the burnout was younger, had remained in his primary CES position for a longer time, was closer in miles to his immediate line leader, had moved more recently, was part of a larger faculty, and did not have as much education as his colleague who was not suffering burnout. It is important to note that none of the characteristics describing the typical victim of burnout had enough significance to allow for generalization to a larger population. So, other than further study of the relationships among burnout, age, primary CES position, and years since last primary
position change, there is little value seen in further research involving the demographic characteristics of CES educators and their relationship to burnout.

The First Research Question

CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience were asked to rank, in order of significance, the three factors out of the 28 possible, that each considered most effective in deterring burnout. The purpose of the first research question was to determine the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as ranked by direct response of the CES educators.

Using a procedure described in detail in Chapter Three, all of the responses (first, second, and third choices) were weighted so that each of the 28 factors cited as deterrents to burnout could be ranked according to the number of times it was chosen as an effective deterrent. Following are the 10 factors ranked as the most effective deterrents to burnout:

1.0 Being recognized and appreciated for achievements.
2.0 Having a happy marriage
3.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude
4.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment
5.0 Living Gospel principles
6.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader

7.5 Feeling challenged by one's job assignment

7.5 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job

9.0 Being able to express opinions to one's line leader

10.0 Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order.

To corroborate the results obtained from the first method of ranking the deterrents, a second method of ranking the most effective deterrents to burnout was devised. The mean response was calculated for each of the 28 deterrents according to the scores they received from each respondent, when presented in Section B of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire. Following are the 10 most effective deterrents as ranked by the second method:

1.0 Being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments

2.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude

3.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment

4.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader

5.0 Having a consistent program of good diet and exercise
6.5 Being able to express opinions to one's line leader

6.5 Having a happy marriage

8.0 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job

9.0 Leaders' employing democratic leadership styles

10.0 Periodic meditation about one's blessings.

Seven of the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout were common to both of the rankings. Thirteen of the 28 possible deterrents were found in one or the other, or both, of the rankings.

(1) Having a happy marriage; (2) enjoying life and having a positive attitude; (3) living Gospel principles; (4) having hobbies/avocations away from the job; (5) keeping priorities in order, namely, (a) family, (b) Church, and (c) work; (6) having a consistent program of good diet and exercise; and (7) periodically meditating about one's blessings are all within the stewardship of the individual. The responsibility for seeing that these factors are effective as deterrents to burnout rests squarely upon the educator.

On the other hand, CES leaders and administrators largely determine if the educators will (1) feel recognized and appreciated for their accomplishments, (2) feel needed in their job assignments, (3) be able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that affect their working conditions, (4) feel
challenged by their work assignments, (5) enjoy positive relationships with their line leaders, and (6) benefit from working under line leaders who practice the principles of democratic leadership.

Of the six deterrents above which are primarily influenced by the CES administration's philosophy and policies, four are common to both methods of ranking. The consistency of the respondents' answers is one indication that the findings are valid, and that the responses were carefully considered before they were chosen.

The Second Research Question

The second research question asked what were the notable differences between the most effective deterrents to burnout ranked by the CES educators in this study and the 10 most effective deterrents ranked by the CES educators in the Douglas study.

Following are the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout ranked by direct response of the CES educators in the Douglas (1982, pp. 225-226) study:

1.0 Having a happy marriage
2.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment
3.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude
4.0 Being recognized and appreciated for achievements
5.0 Living Gospel principles
6.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
7.0 Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
8.0 Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order
9.0 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
10.0 Being interested in other people.

The 10 most effective deterrents to burnout ranked by the direct response of CES educators in this study were:

1.0 Being recognized and appreciated for achievements
2.0 Having a happy marriage
3.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude
4.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment
5.0 Living Gospel principles
6.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
7.0 Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
8.0 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
9.0 Being able to express opinions to one's line leader
10.0 Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order.
Nine of the 10 deterrents ranked most effective by the successful, veteran CES educators in the Douglas study were also chosen by the CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience who participated in this study! Between the two studies there were a total of 693 respondents, with ages ranging from 28 to over 60; having from 6 to 34 years experience. A great diversity of opinion regarding the most effective deterrents to burnout was possible, yet it is not evident in the findings.

"Being interested in other people," the deterrent ranked tenth in the Douglas study, and "Being able to express opinions to one's line leader," which was ranked ninth in this study, are the notable differences in ranking between the two studies.

Four out of the nine factors (deterrents) common to both studies received an equivalent ranking in each study. The probability of that occurring by chance was not calculated, but from a subjective point of view, the coincidence is remarkable.

(1) Being recognized and appreciated for achievements, (2) feeling needed in one's job assignment, (3) having a positive relationship with one's line leader, and (4) feeling challenged by one's job assignment, were common to both studies and should confirm the notion that among the rank and file of CES educators, there is a
firm consensus of opinion regarding the type of professional relationship they desire to have with CES administrators and leaders.

Additional Findings

The deterrent chosen as "most unpopular" by the CES educators was item 19, "An authoritarian leadership style on the part of a line leader acts as a deterrent to burnout in the followers," with 97.2 percent (175 respondents) disagreeing. Seventy-five percent (135 men) of the respondents agreed with item 25 in Section B that "Faculty in-service improvements have been instrumental in deterring educator burnout on the job" and 73.5 percent (133 men) agreed that "Curriculum improvements made by the System are factors helping educators avoid job burnout" (item 24).

Item 26 in Section B, "Some sort of merit pay scale to reward the outstanding educator will serve as a deterrent to burnout" was disagreed with by 66.1 percent (117) of the educators. So, although 81.3 percent (148 men) of the educators had supplemental income, only one-third of the respondents agreed that increased salary would deter burnout. It is also possible, though, that what the educators disliked was the idea of a merit system and not additional money.
On the other hand, just 51.1 percent (93 men) of the educators agreed that "those with higher total incomes will show less signs of burnout than will those with lower incomes" (item 9).

There were 109 educators (61.3 percent) who reported that "I know men my age who are questioning their choice of careers," yet only 65 respondents (36.7 percent indicated that "I often wonder if I am making progress in my career."

Almost without exception, the men reported they found great personal satisfaction in their work and felt like they were accomplishing something "worthwhile" in their work. A dozen educators confirmed that "If it were possible I would change careers."

Just as a thermometer cannot be used to measure blood pressure, so a questionnaire cannot measure intangibles. Burnout and career appraisal are complex, subjective experiences. It is acknowledged that the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire is at best a crude thermometer.

However, by respectfully considering the respondents' handwritten comments, one can learn more about the patient (CES) than his pulse rate. A wise physician knows that not all of the vital signs are measured by use of his medical instruments. Some qualities of the human spirit that are vital to a person's
well-being (i.e., will to live) are best discerned through intuition. With that thought in mind, the investigator encourages all who examine this study to reread the personal comments of the respondents found at the end of Chapter Three. It is the writer's opinion that although the body (CES) is generally quite fit, there are symptoms which indicate that certain nutrients are lacking. It is understood that each person's judgment in this matter will be unique, but the reader is reminded of a principle taught by great literature: a significant message transcends the words used to convey it. Therefore, the reader is encouraged to treat the following comments with the same regard that is accorded the findings of statistical technique. If empathy is used to evaluate the comments of those who feel themselves to be victims of burnout, then a great deal of practical, significant information can be gained.

A 33-year-old institute instructor with nine years experience asserted:

I don't think your questionnaire really addresses some of the issues that are at the heart of CES burnout. Your questions place all of the burden and responsibility on the teacher and not enough on the circumstances in which the System exists. You cannot be very achievement motivated without feeling that you are aspiring. If you feel the need to voice your concern or frustration you might be guilty of apostate tendencies or seen as a "fallen angel." Is a position in the CES a calling or a profession? There seems to exist a lack of consensus on the issue. We say it is whatever is expedient at the moment.
Many men in the 28-35 age group feel trapped. They love their classroom experience. They want a career with the CES, but see few opportunities to have new and challenging experiences without major financial sacrifices, i.e., moves, living on less than full salary to pursue degrees, etc.

As a Church we believe in being goal-oriented and are taught that we should seek to reach our full potential. If a man feels the need to have new challenges and he is in pain because those opportunities do not exist, it is a disservice to the man and to the department to tell him that he is not in pain, or that he should not be in pain, or that he has brought this pain upon himself (your questionnaire). If he has a high need for a varied and progressive experience, it might not have anything to do with his testimony or the tranquility of his domestic affairs. You cannot equate pain and frustration.

If a man says he is frustrated, the last thing he needs is a CES leader to moralize with him. I would rather have an administrator say, "I know you are in pain, and I'm sorry I can't do anything about it," than to try to convince me that I am not in pain, or that my pain is better than someone else's.

Two other seminary teachers who reported burnout commented:

There is only so much upward mobility. After 6 years in a high school classroom, I see only 6 more years doing the same thing.

One of the problems with Church educator burnout centers around the idea: always a teacher. That philosophy has a nice ring to it, but in the realistic classroom [it] is hollow. There is no upward movement—no career ladders or goals. There is a great chance for the majority to stagnate or quit.

A released-time seminary teacher who had taught for 6 years (age 29) appended three type-written pages of comments from colleagues that he felt were relevant to burnout. Several excerpts were:
Why is it when we sometimes feel the drive to express our real inner feelings, we are afraid to do so to our line leaders or those we perceive are in power in the seminary system, without fear of it affecting our job in some way or another?

Why is it that I feel my feelings about seminary are so bottled up at times? I wish I had some way of just telling my leaders what seminary is really like for me, and how facing the kids each day is for me.

Another 29 year old released-time seminary teacher who had also taught for 6 years entreated:

I entered this profession with the idea of making it a lifetime career. I promised myself that I would continue to teach Seminary as long as I felt successful at it. My evaluation of success is feeling like I am improving as a teacher each year. With each year I teach, I find it more and more difficult to evaluate whether or not I have improved as a teacher. I would like more opportunities to meet with line leadership on an individual basis and feel like I am free to express my feelings and concerns. If classroom teaching is the backbone of the CES, and the administrators want to improve the classroom experience, then why not spend more time talking to the man in the classroom and take seriously the suggestions he makes?

An eight year seminary man, aged 32, contended:

The truth of the matter is that a seminary teacher on the Wasatch Front suffers abuse from students who he can require nothing from. He is viewed by much of the LDS community as a leech on tithing funds and receives either benign non-support or cheap criticism from the CES middle management.

As an afterthought, he added: "Please don't bother me with anymore questionnaires!"

With seven years experience, a 31-year-old seminary teacher exclaimed: "I wonder if anyone ever sees the value of the work I do--I see little evidence. But then,
I realize the SES [student evaluation] gives the administration everything they want to know!"

A released-time seminary teacher who had taught for nine years and pencilled in that his age was not the researcher's business said that burnout was in part caused by the administration:

NOT LISTENING TO US . . . except through stupid doctoral questionnaires which are never really used or reported on.

I love teaching. It is my life. I feel there is an unwillingness of more CES personnel to honestly respond for fear of being identified. We need help. All is not well in CES, please don't send questionnaires. Just come, sit down with us; let us honestly respond.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The Problem

A number of descriptive studies of burnout among public school teachers has been conducted in recent years (Kurtz, 1980). Thus far, though, field-research has not identified many of the variables that have significant relationships to burnout.

It has been posited that most men experience a crisis relating to career appraisal sometime between the ages of 28-33 (Levinson, 1978). There is a possibility that the experience of career appraisal and burnout are related for men 28-33 years old.

In 1982, a select group of religious educators was surveyed to determine effective deterrents to burnout, and it was found that one of every 10 religious educators reported burnout (Douglas, 1982). Further research on variables significantly related to burnout was needed.

Purpose

It was the primary purpose of this study to examine the relationship between the career appraisal "crisis" experience and burnout among CES educators with 6 to 10
years experience (typically 28-33 years old). Also, the factors ranked by the CES educators as most significant in deterring burnout were to be reported, and then compared to the respective findings from the Douglas study.

**Hypotheses**

This study was designed to test the following hypotheses:

1. There will be no significant relationship between the items measuring career appraisal crisis and the reported status of burnout among CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience, as measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.

2. There will be no significant relationship between the incidence of reported burnout among CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience and the following demographic factors: (a) current age, (b) current level of education, (c) years since last geographical move, (e) geographical distance from line leader, (e) years since last primary CES position change, and (f) size of full-time faculty (including self), as measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.
Research Questions

This study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as ranked by direct response of CES educators to Section C of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire?

2. What are the notable differences between the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as perceived (ranked) by the CES educators who participated in this study and the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as chosen by the CES educators who participated in the Douglas study?

Delimitations

This study was limited to educators in the Church Educational System (CES) of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, in the United States, who had at least six years of service in the CES as of September 1, 1982, and not more than 10 years service as of June 15, 1983. These educators were under the direction of the CES's associate commissioner of education and served in either some area of released-time seminary, institute of religion, special education seminary, or Lamanite seminary.

Besides those educators serving as teachers, this study further included educators serving as central office
staff, administrators, coordinators, curriculum writers, and those on special assignment (such as sabbatical leave) having 6 to 10 years experience.

Educators at Brigham Young University (BYU), Ricks College, BYU-Hawaii campus, LDS Business College, or the elementary and secondary schools in foreign lands having 6 to 10 years service were not included in this study.

Methods and Procedures

The literature review undertaken was twofold. The review of literature on burnout was based on Douglas' (1982) review. The most recent, relevant findings concerning burnout were added. In addition, a review of the literature dealing with adult development was completed and reported.

The instrument used in the Douglas study, Questionnaire on Deterrents to Burnout, was adapted for use in this study. A battery of 12 statements measuring attitudes and beliefs about the subjects' work and career were developed. Through field-testing, it was determined that the revised instrument had content validity and face value as a measure of career appraisal.

The basic criteria used in establishing the population to be surveyed was that the CES educators had taught for at least 6 years and not more than 10 years. It was believed that approximately half of such
A population would be 28-33 years old. That age group was important because the career appraisal experience was posited to occur during that time.

A complete list of all CES educators' names and addresses living in the United States was provided by the personnel department of the CES. There were 204 men in the total population of interest. As the population of interest and the sample were coterminous, no sampling technique was employed.

On April 16, 1983, the 204 CES educators were mailed a questionnaire under cover letter from the associate commissioner of the Church Educational System. After three weeks, there had been an 80 percent return. A follow-up letter was sent to non-respondents on May 10, 1983. Within two weeks, 185 questionnaires had been returned, for a 90.1 percent response.

Computer analysis of the data was completed at Brigham Young University's Center for Statistical Research. Statistical techniques from SPSS were used. The analysis of the data and corresponding tables can be found in Chapter Three.

**Findings**

The findings of this study are summarized with the hypotheses and research questions to which they pertain.
Hypothesis One

There will be no significant predictive power in the items measuring career appraisal crisis in correctly classifying the status of burnout among CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience, as measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.

1. It was determined that the six items selected as best measuring career appraisal crisis explained 40.7 percent of the variability of reported burnout, therefore, a significant relationship between the items measuring career appraisal crisis and status of burnout was implied.

2. The sixth career appraisal variable, "If it were possible I would change careers," was the variable second most influential in accounting for the variance of burnout.

3. Variable six, described above, was also found to be the best predictor of burnout.

4. The first career appraisal variable, "I often wonder if I am making progress in my career," accounted for more of the variance in burnout than any of the other variables.

5. Variable one, described above, was also determined to be the second best predictor of burnout, in the discriminate analysis.
6. There were 147 educators (or 40.8 percent) in this study who reported no feelings of burnout, while 29 educators (or 16.8 percent) reported they were burned out.

7. When divided into age groups, the incidence of burnout among the younger educators (28-33 years old) was 22.35 percent (19 men), and the incidence of burnout among the older educators (34-58 years old) was 10.42 percent (10 men).

8. Twenty-three men (79.3 percent) of the educators who reported burnout were classified correctly through use of a classification rule (in discriminate analysis) involving the six career appraisal variables and altogether 83.72 percent of the grouped (not burned out group and burned out group) were correctly classified.

Hypothesis Two

There will be no significant predictive powers in the following demographic factors: (a) current age, (b) current level of education, (c) years since last geographical move, (d) geographical distance from line leader, (e) years since last primary CES position change, and (f) size of full-time faculty (including self), in correctly classifying the status of burnout among CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience, as defined and measured by the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire.
9. There was enough evidence from statistical analysis of the data to reject the null hypothesis that there was no significant relationship between the status of burnout among CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience and the demographic factors listed above.

10. The classification rule formulated through discriminate analysis correctly classified 69.77 percent of the educators in the group (burned out or not burned out) to which they belonged, however, only 62.1 percent of the burned out educators were classified correctly.

11. It was determined that the demographic factor (variable) of current age was the best predictor of burnout, among the six demographic factors examined in discriminate analysis.

12. The discriminate analysis revealed that the mean age of those who reported burnout was less than the mean age of the group not reporting burnout; one possible implication being that there was more of a tendency to burnout among the younger educators.

13. "Years since last primary CES position change" was determined to be the second best predictor variable of burnout.

14. Examination of the data indicated that the burned out group's mean response to "years since last primary CES position change" was higher than the mean response
of the group not burned out, which implied that those who reported burnout had been in their current CES assignments longer than those who had not burned out.

15. Only 3.3 percent of the amount of variance in burnout among the CES educators who participated in this study could be explained by the six demographic factors mentioned above, so the practical significance of the findings was listed.

**Research Question One**

What are the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout as ranked by direct response of the CES educators to Section C of the Douglas/Allred Questionnaire?

16. When the CES educators with 6 to 10 years experience ranked deterrents to burnout by direct response, the 10 most effective deterrents were:

1.0 Being recognized and appreciated for achievements
2.0 Having a happy marriage
3.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude
4.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment
5.0 Living Gospel principles
6.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
7.5 Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
7.5 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
9.0 Being able to express opinions to one's line leader

10.0 Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order.

17. When ranked by the mean score calculated for each of the 28 deterrents from the disagree-agree statements, the 10 most effective deterrents were:

1.0 Being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments.

2.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude

3.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment

4.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader

5.0 Having a consistent program of good diet and exercise

6.5 Being able to express opinions to one's line leader

6.5 Having a happy marriage

8.0 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job

9.0 Leaders' employing democratic leadership styles

10.0 Periodic meditation about one's blessings.

Research Question Two

What are the notable differences between the 10 most effective deterrents ranked by the CES educators who participated in this study and the 10 most effective
deterrents to burnout as chosen by the CES educators who participated in the Douglas study?

18. The 10 deterrents ranked most effective by the CES educators in Douglas' study were:

1.0 Having a happy marriage
2.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment
3.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude
4.0 Being recognized and appreciated for achievements
5.0 Living Gospel principles
6.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
7.0 Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
8.0 Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order
9.0 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
10.0 Being interested in other people.

19. The participants of this study ranked the following 10 deterrents as most effective:

1.0 Being recognized and appreciated for achievements
2.0 Having a happy marriage
3.0 Enjoying life and having a positive attitude
4.0 Feeling needed in one's job assignment
5.0 Living Gospel principles
6.0 Having a positive relationship with one's line leader
7.5 Feeling challenged by one's job assignment
7.5 Having hobbies and avocations away from the job
9.0 Being able to express opinions to one's line leader
10.0 Keeping priorities of family, Church, and work in order.

20. The deterrent ranked tenth in the Douglas study, "Being interested in other people," was not among the 10 deterrents ranked most effective by the CES educators in this study.

21. The deterrent ranked ninth by the CES educators in this study, "Being able to express opinions to one's line leader," was not ranked as one of the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout by the participants of the Douglas study.

**Additional Findings**

22. There was almost unanimous disagreement, 97.2 percent, that "An authoritarian leadership style on the part of a line leader acts as a deterrent to burnout in the followers."

23. Seventy-five percent (135 men) of the respondents agreed that "Faculty in-service improvements have been instrumental in deterring educator burnout on the job."
24. There were 133 educators, 73.5 percent, who agreed that "Curriculum improvements made by the System are factors helping educators avoid job burnout."

25. Sixty-six point one percent (117 men) disagreed that "Some sort of merit pay scale to reward the outstanding educator will serve as a deterrent to burnout."

26. One hundred nine educators, 61.3 percent, indicated that "I know men my age in CES who are questioning their choice of careers."

27. Sixty-five respondents, 36.7 percent, reported that "I often wonder if I am making progress in my career."

28. Another 65 respondents, 36.7 percent, indicated that "I have never really questioned my choice of a career in the CES."

29. Only two educators (1.1 percent) indicated that "I wonder if I am really accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work" was exactly how they felt.

30. Three educators (1.7 percent) reported that "Working in the CES has always been a source of great personal satisfaction to me" did not describe at how they felt.

31. Twelve CES educators (6.7 percent) confirmed that "If it were possible I would change careers."
Handwritten Comments by the Respondents

32. A number of the respondents indicated that poor communication channels with the CES administration was a source of great frustration.

33. More than a dozen comments related the feeling that one could not be candid about work/career frustrations because of the CES administration's attitude toward such expressions.

34. The importance of a peer support network in deterring burnout was reiterated by many of the men.

35. Positive student/teacher relationships was also mentioned often as an important deterrent to burnout.

36. Receiving more than "token" recognition and appreciation was brought out in several of the most brusque comments.

37. Lack of career development/planning opportunities with CES administrators was also a strongly voiced concern.

38. Other factors commented on were: importance of commitment in deterring burnout, the need for more preparation time to increase teaching effectiveness.

39. It is noted that relatively few comments related to a perceived need for much larger salaries in order to deter burnout.
40. Several of the comments gave evidence that a num-
ber of the educators expected to feel burned out and were
resigned to that experience; they felt it was inevitable.
41. A few of the respondents expressed great joy
in their work with CES.

Conclusions

The findings of this study led to the following
consclusions:

1. If the results of the statistical analyses con-
ducted in this study are valid, then Section F of the
Douglas/Allred Questionnaire, which deals with career
appraisal, has value/usefulness in predicting those
likely to burnout, and its further development and use
could help deter burnout in the CES.

2. Analysis of the responses to career appraisal
items in Section F reported by the burned out group
indicate that those most likely to report burnout do not
feel like they are progressing in their career and would
change careers if possible; therefore, these two factors
should be kept in mind as issues to be addressed during
in-service and through other methods of professional
development in order to further deter burnout.

3. The majority of CES educators surveyed, 86.7
percent, or 147 respondents, did not report any feelings
of burnout, while 16.8 percent, or 29 educators, did
report burnout, so the great majority of educators feel
successful in their assignments; while one out of every
six educators surveyed is not successfully coping with his current assignment.

4. When divided into age groups, 22.35 percent of the educators in the younger age group (28-33 years) reported burnout, as compared to 10.42 percent of the older age group (34-58 years) who reported burnout; therefore, it is concluded that younger CES educators have a greater tendency to burnout.

5. Of the six demographic variables examined to determine the relationship between them and the incidence of burnout among CES educators, current age was found to be the best predictor of burnout, with those who burn out being younger than those who did not burn out, therefore, the younger CES educators have a greater need for ongoing professional development to help them feel that they are progressing in their careers and thus deter burnout, or at least deter the feeling that they would change careers if possible.

6. "Years since last primary CES position change" is also a significant demographic variable that is useful in predicting burnout, as those who burn out remain longer in their primary position than those who do not burn out, and this factor should be kept in mind each year as new assignments are given and transfers made.

7. According to the results of this study, there is limited value in further research into the relationship
among most of the demographic variables in the CES educator's life/job settings and the incidence of burnout, with the exception of (a) current age, (b) years since last primary CES position change, and (c) primary CES position, which do appear to have significant relationships with burnout; therefore, to deter burnout in the CES, more research into the three factors just enumerated should be undertaken.

8. Between the two methods of ranking the 10 most effective deterrents to burnout, only 13 of the 28 deterrent alternatives appeared.

   a. Six of the most effective deterrents to burnout can and therefore should be addressed by CES administrators and line leaders, who largely determine whether CES educators (1) feel recognized and appreciated for their accomplishments, (2) feel needed in their job assignments, (3) are able to express opinions to their line leaders before decisions that affect their working conditions are made, (4) feel challenged by their work assignments, (5) have positive relationships with their line leaders, and (6) work under leaders who practice/use democratic leadership.

   b. Those attitudes/behaviors in each individual's personal life that are most effective in deterring job burnout include: (1) having a
happy marriage; (2) enjoying life and having a positive attitude; (3) living Gospel principles; (4) hobbies/avocations; (5) keeping priorities in order, namely (a) family, (b) Church, and (c) work; (6) having a consistent program of good diet and exercise; and (7) periodically meditating about one's blessings, therefore, this information should be disseminated to the men in the field through whatever means considered appropriate.

10. The lack of difference between the 10 deterrents chosen by each of the two different groups of CES educators (successful veteran educators versus all 6 to 10 year educators) is notable. Although not of practical significance, it is remarkable that (a) enjoying life and having a positive attitude, (b) living Gospel principles, (c) having a positive relationship with one's line leader, and (d) feeling challenged by one's job assignment all had equivalent rankings, and indicates that many of the CES educators have quite similar thoughts on what factors are most significant in deterring burnout.

   a. (1) Being recognized and appreciated for achievements, (2) feeling needed in one's job assignment, (3) having a positive relationship with one's line leader, and (4) feeling challenged by one's job assignment indicate that the majority of CES educators surveyed desire a particular type of
professional relationship with their line leaders and administrators, yet based upon the respondents' comments, there is disdain for the type of professional relationships many of the educators have with their line leaders/administrators, thus, the administration should consider what steps are necessary to improve its "image" and working relationship with men in the field.

11. A great majority of the men do not appreciate an authoritarian line leader, therefore, line leaders need to be taught a more effective leadership style.

12. Most of the men are aware of recent changes in curriculum and in-service, and feel that the changes have helped alleviate or deter conditions which in the past fostered burnout, therefore, in-service is an acceptable means of addressing issues vital to deterring burnout.

13. The concept of a merit pay system is unpopular with two-thirds of the CES educators surveyed, therefore, such a system would not be effective in deterring burnout in the CES.

14. Very few of the educators feel that their work is not worthwhile, and all but several find great personal satisfaction in their work, which indicates that the great majority of CES educators find their greatest satisfaction/fulfillment through intrinsic rewards.
15. The strongest and most urgent feelings expressed in the handwritten comments are related to a lack of opportunity to engage in career counseling sponsored by the CES administration. The tone of many comments suggests that the CES administration is felt to be remiss by not actively being involved in human resource planning/development, and in addition, some educators perceive that the administration's philosophy regarding career development discourages their efforts to participate in meaningful discussions about personal plans/goals with line leaders, therefore, there should be a continued effort made by the CES administration to clarify its philosophy/policies concerning career and professional development.

**Recommendations**

Based upon this study and its conclusions:

1. It is recommended that further research be done concerning the relationship between career appraisal and burnout, with emphasis given to helping understand how educators perceive their careers are satisfactorily progressing. How burnout is influenced by the variables (a) current age, (b) years since last primary CES position change, and (c) primary CES position should also be examined more closely. All CES educators with one to five years experience, and those veteran educators not
surveyed by Douglas are groups that could be studied in future research.

2. It is recommended that the Church Education System administrators determine what an acceptable incidence of burnout is, as 16.8 percent of the CES educators having 6 to 10 years experience reported burnout, and 10.96 percent of the successful, veteran CES educators in the Douglas (1982) study reported burnout.

3. It is recommended that Church Education System line leaders and administrators receive training from organizational behavior consultants in (a) helping educators feel needed and challenged in their job assignments, (b) showing recognition and appreciation of their subordinate's accomplishments, (c) more effectively involving subordinates in appropriate decision-making/policy-setting processes, (d) developing positive relationships with those working under them, and (e) practicing the principles of democratic leadership.

4. It is recommended that the CES administration use faculty in-service and special seminars or workshops to disseminate the relevant findings from this study, namely, that there are seven attitudes/behaviors which, when practiced in personal life, will be helpful in deterring burnout on the job. Faculty in-service and district level seminars/workshops conducted by CES administrators
would be invaluable forums for open discussion of burnout, its causes, and its deterents.

5. It is recommended that the CES administration address the need for a more comprehensive and detailed program of human resource development. One aspect of the program would consist of regular department-sponsored career counseling, which could be carried out by Teacher Support Services personnel quite effectively because their position is non-threatenning in terms of their power or authority over field personnel.
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Appendix
Dear Brethren:

Last year we surveyed our teachers who had been teaching for more than ten years to help determine the most successful preventive measures in deterring burn-out. To validate the findings from this study and to give us additional information from the teachers, such as you, who have taught from five to nine years, Keith Allred has developed the enclosed questionnaire, for his thesis project.

To assist us in this study, we would like for you to spend a few minutes in carefully filling out this questionnaire and sending it back to us as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope.

All questionnaire information will be strictly confidential and there will be no personal identity associated with any of the questionnaires.

Your input is essential in order for this study to be meaningful. We appreciate your time and effort in this matter.

Sincerely,

Stanley A. Peterson
Associate Commissioner
Questionnaire on Deterrents to Burn-out

This questionnaire is divided into two parts:

(i) Biographical data
(ii) Your experience with and assessment of what deter burn-out

### Biographical data

**A. Please circle the appropriate item.**

1. **Years with CES (include 1982-1983)**
   - a. 5 years
   - b. 6 years
   - c. 7 years
   - d. 8 years
   - e. 9 years

2. **Your current age in years**
   - a. 27 or under
   - b. 28
   - c. 29
   - d. 30
   - e. 31
   - f. 32
   - g. 33
   - h. Other

3. **Gender:**
   - M
   - F

4. **Current level of education**
   - a. B.A./B.S.
   - b. M.A./M.S.
   - c. Ed.D./Ph.D.
   - d. hours toward Adv. degree (circle)
   - e. Other, please specify

5. **Highest degree sought**
   - a. Bachelor's
   - b. Master's
   - c. Doctorate
   - d. Other, please specify

6. **Years since last geographical move**
   - a. 0-1 year
   - b. 2-3 years
   - c. 4-5 years
   - d. 6-7 years
   - e. 8 or more years

7. **Geographical distance from your immediate line leader**
   - a. 0-9 miles
   - b. 10-29 miles
   - c. 30-49 miles
   - d. 50-99 miles
   - e. 100-199 miles
   - f. Over 200 miles

8. **Years since last primary CES position change (function, not title)**
   - a. 0-1 year
   - b. 2-3 years
   - c. 4-5 years
   - d. 6-7 years
   - e. 8 or more years

9. **Size of full-time faculty (including yourself) in facility where you work**
   - a. 1 person
   - b. 2 people
   - c. 3 people
   - d. 4 people
   - e. 5 or more people

10. **Frequency of your attendance at faculty in-service meetings**
    - a. Never
    - b. Once a year
    - c. Twice a year
    - d. Quarterly
    - e. Bi-monthly
    - f. Monthly
    - g. Twice-à-month

11. **Marital status**
    - a. Single
    - b. Married
    - c. Divorced
    - d. Widowed

12. **Number of children living at home**
    - a. None
    - b. 1
    - c. 2
    - d. 3
    - e. 4
    - f. 5
    - g. 6
    - h. 7 or more

B. Please indicate what your primary position or job assignment is currently.

1. **Administration**
   - a. Home Study Seminary
   - b. Early Morning Seminary
   - c. Released-time Seminary
   - d. Lamanite Seminary
   - e. Special Education
   - f. Institute of Religion
   - g. Curriculum
   - h. Teacher Support
   - i. Other(s), please specify

2. **Teaching**
   - a. Released-time Seminary
   - b. Lamanite Seminary
   - c. Special Education
   - d. Institute of Religion
   - e. Other(s), please specify
Biographical data continued

C. Please check as many as apply to you:

1. In which of the below areas do you presently serve in a called Church capacity?
   a. General Board, Regional Representative, Stake Presidency
   b. Bishop, Bishop's counselor
   c. Stake High Council
   d. Quorum Presidency: Advisor
   e. Patriarch
   f. Auxiliary/Priesthood teacher
   g. Stake Board Member
   h. Stake Missionary
   i. Other(s), please specify ____________________________

2. In which of the following do you have involvement in community government or community affairs?
   a. State government officer
   b. County government officer
   c. City government officer
   d. School board officer
   e. PTA officer
   f. Scouting officer
   g. Non.
   h. Other(s), please specify ____________________________

3. Do you have sources of income in addition to your CES salary?
   a. No
   b. Yes

   If your answer to the above question is 'No', please go on to part II. If your answer is 'Yes', please complete questions 4 and 5.

4. How much income did you have in 1981 in addition to your CES salary (include your spouse's income, but not your children's)?
   a. $1-5999
   b. $6000-9999
   c. $10,000-19,999
   d. $20,000-29,999
   e. Over $30,000

5. If you had additional income, what were the sources (Include all applicable)?
   a. Property, investments, inheritance
   b. Second job (not including summer work)
   c. Summer job
   d. Working spouse
   e. Other(s), please specify ____________________________

Part 2

Experience with assessments of burn-out deterrents

*Burn-out has been defined as: A state of fatigue; a frustration brought on by devotion to a cause or relationship that fails to produce the expected results. It may involve a failure or wearing out; becoming exhausted by excessive demands on time, energy, and resources. It may involve feeling locked into a job routine. It involves feeling unappreciated by those we serve either up or down-line from one's assignment. It is a condition where one's energy and motivation is dissipated at a faster rate than it can be generated. It involves feeling powerless to change certain work conditions that seem never to change, and which cause a worker to feel frustrated and worn down. It is a drained psychological condition resulting from draining experiences which foster burnout and impaired productivity. A typical statement from one experiencing burn-out is: "Other years I've felt like I'm ready for summer vacation in April, but this year I felt like that in November."

A. In this section, and in B, following, please indicate the answer that most closely represents your feelings and experiences by circling the number following each question or statement: 1(strongly disagree), 2(disagree), 3(agree), or 4(strongly agree):

Example

0. Changing jobs within CES acts as a deterrent to burn-out.
   1 2 3 4

   strongly disagree disagree agree strongly agree

1. Considering the foregoing explanation of burn-out, I'd say I feel burned out in my present CES assignment.

(2)
## Experience with assessments continued

**B. Please indicate answers to your experiences with and assessment of what prevents or deters burn-out:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Those who enjoy life, and have positive, optimistic attitudes toward life are less likely to evidence signs of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Those who have a consistent program of good diet and exercise are less apt to have feelings of burn-out on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One's degree of burn-out is closely related to one's strength of testimony of the Gospel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Those who are most interested in other people are least likely to show signs of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Living Gospel principles, i.e., prayer, scripture study, fasting, service, etc., will deter burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Those who feel challenged in their CES job assignment are less apt to show signs of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frequent (each 3 to 5 years) transfers and changes in assignment are deterrents to burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Altering job descriptions within existing CES assignments will prevent feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Those with higher total incomes will show less signs of burn-out than will those with lower incomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Having a challenging Church assignment where one feels needed is a deterrent to feeling burned-out on one's job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If one keeps his priorities in order, namely, a) family, b) Church, and c) professional work, he is more likely to curb his feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Burn-out on the job can be deterred if one feels success in the home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hobbies and avocations away from the job are deterrents to burn-out on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Being involved in community and civic affairs off the job prevents one from feeling burn-out on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A happy marriage is a deterrent to burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Feeling needed in one's CES assignment helps prevent feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments and achievements deters burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A positive relationship with one's line leader is a deterrent to burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. An authoritarian leadership style on the part of a line leader acts as a deterrent to burn-out in the followers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience with assessments continued

B. Please indicate answers to your experiences with and assessment of what prevents or deters burn-out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>A democratic leadership style on the part of a line leader serves to deter burn-out in those working under his direction.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>A laisse-faire leadership style on the part of a line leader contributes to a follower being able to curb feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that effect working conditions acts as a deterrent to burn-out for the worker.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Periodic meditation about one's blessings can prove to help prevent job burn-out.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Curriculum improvements made by the System are factors helping educators avoid job burn-out.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Faculty in-service improvements have been instrumental in deterring educator burn-out on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Some sort of merit pay scale to reward the outstanding educator will serve as a deterrent to burn-out.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Burn-out is more apt to appear in workers over 35 years old, than in workers under 35 years of age.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Maturation of personality appears to be a factor in curbing job burn-out.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Select 3 of the 28 factors mentioned in section B. preceding, which you think are most significant in deterring burn-out. Please rank them in descending order:

Most significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Select 3 of the 28 factors mentioned in section B. preceding, which you think are least significant in deterring burn-out. Please rank them in order of least significance to you:

Least significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Please include comments concerning deterrents to burn-out in your work with CES that you would like to make, that you feel are not adequately covered by the questionnaire:

F. How well do the following statements describe your experience and feelings? Circle the number that corresponds most with your feelings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Does not describe at all</th>
<th>Describes exactly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most men go through times when they feel strongly that something is not quite right with their life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Around age thirty many men seriously question whether they are achieving their career goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I know men my age in CES who are questioning their choice of careers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I often wonder if I am making progress in my career.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I have never really questioned my choice of a career in the CES.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel like I am progressing in my career.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Working in the CES has always been a source of great personal satisfaction to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wonder if I am really accomplishing anything worthwhile in my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There are other careers I could probably enjoy just as much as working in the CES.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If it were possible I would change careers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. By about age thirty-five it is probably too late for a man to be changing careers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Those who question how meaningful their work is are most likely to burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Additional feelings or insights concerning experiences involving reassessment/re-evaluation of your career would be appreciated:

Thank you very much. Please return the completed questionnaire in the attached, pre-addressed, stamped envelope at your earliest convenience after receiving it.
May 10, 1983

Dear Brethren,

Recently a survey concerning deterrents to burn-out in the CSS was mailed. A number of the questionnaires have not yet been received.

We recognize that there are many difficulties associated with such a survey. Some of you probably never received the questionnaire; in other instances the survey has possibly been misplaced, and we feel confident that others are completed but not yet mailed.

If you have not received a questionnaire, or have questions regarding its use, please phone Brother Don Bond in the Church Office Building. His phone number is 1-501-531-4440.

We are anxious to receive input from each man in this important study. If you have not yet mailed your questionnaire please do so at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Teaching Support Services
QUESTIONNAIRE ON DETERRENTS TO BURN-OUT

This questionnaire is divided into two parts: I. Biographical data, and II. Your experience with and assessment of what prevents or deters burn-out.

I. Biographical Data
A. Please check (x) one:

1. Age (in years).
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
<th>56-60</th>
<th>61+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Years with CES (include 1981-82).
   
   |-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|

3. Years since last geographical move.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Years since last primary CES position change (function, not title).
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-4</th>
<th>5-9</th>
<th>10-14</th>
<th>15-19</th>
<th>20-24</th>
<th>25-29</th>
<th>30+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. Geographical distance (in miles) from your immediate line leader.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-9</th>
<th>10-29</th>
<th>30-49</th>
<th>50-99</th>
<th>100-199</th>
<th>200+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Size of full-time faculty (include self) in facility where you work.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Frequency of your attendance at faculty in-service meetings.
   
   Never  | Twice a month | Monthly | 81-100 | Quarterly | Semi- | Annually | Annually |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Month</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monthly</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Marital status.
   
   Married | Single | Divorced | Widow/Widower
   |---------|--------|----------|----------|

9. Number of children living at home.
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-7</th>
<th>8+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
8. In the space provided opposite each designated program place the percentage of your professional time devoted to the following for which you have primary CES function:

1. Administration
   a. ___ Home Study Seminary
   b. ___ Early Morning Seminary
   c. ___ Released-time Seminary
   d. ___ Lamanite Seminary
   e. ___ Special Education
   f. ___ Institute of Religion
   g. ___ Curriculum
   h. ___ Teacher Support
   i. ___ Other(s), please specify ____________________________.
      ___ Total percentage of time in administration.

2. Teaching
   a. ___ Released-time Seminary
   b. ___ Lamanite Seminary
   c. ___ Special Education
   d. ___ Institute of Religion
   e. ___ Other(s), please specify ____________________________.
      ___ Total percentage of time in teaching.

C. Please check (x) as many as apply to you:

1. In which of the below areas do you presently serve in a called Church capacity?
   a. ___ General Board, Regional Representative, Stake Presidency
   b. ___ Bishop, Bishop's counselor
   c. ___ Stake High Council
   d. ___ Quorum Presidency; Advisor
   e. ___ Patriarch
   f. ___ Auxiliary/Priesthood teacher
   g. ___ Stake Board Member
   h. ___ Stake Missionary
   i. ___ Other(s), please specify ____________________________.

2. In which of the following do you have involvement in community government or community affairs?
   a. ___ State government officer
   b. ___ County government officer
   c. ___ City government officer
   d. ___ School board officer
   e. ___ PTA officer
   f. ___ Scouting officer
   g. ___ None
   h. ___ Other(s), please specify ____________________________.
3. Do you have sources of income in addition to your CES salary?
   a. ______ No
   b. ______ Yes
   If your answer to question I, C, 3, is "No", please go on to part II.
   If your answer to question I, C, 3, is "Yes", please complete questions 4 and 5.

4. How much income did you have in 1981 in addition to your CES salary (include your spouse's income, but not your children's)?
   a. $1 - $500
   b. $501 - $2000
   c. $2001 - $3500
   d. $3501 - $5000
   e. $5001 +

5. If you had additional income, what were the sources?
   a. ______ Property, investments, inheritance
   b. ______ Second job (not including summer work)
   c. ______ Summer job
   d. ______ Working spouse
   e. ______ Other(s), please specify______________________.
II. Your experience with, and assessment of, what prevents or deters educator burn-out.

Burn-out has been defined as: A state of fatigue; a frustration brought on by devotion to a cause or relationship that fails to produce the expected results. It may involve a failure or wearing out; becoming exhausted by excessive demands on time, energy, and resources. It may involve feeling locked into a job routine. It involves feeling unappreciated by those we serve either up or down-line from one's assignment. It is a condition where one's energy and motivation is dissipated at a faster rate than it can be regenerated. It involves feeling powerless to change certain work conditions that seem never to change, and which cause a worker to feel frustrated and worn down. It is a drained psychological condition resulting from disgruntling experiences which foster low morale and impaired productivity. A typical statement from one experiencing burn-out is: "Other years I've felt like I'm ready for summer vacation in April, but this year I felt like that in November."

A. In this section, and in B, following, please indicate the answer that most closely represents your feelings and experiences by circling the number following each question or statement:

EXAMPLE

0. Changing jobs within CES acts as a deterrent to burn-out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Considering the foregoing explanation of burn-out, I'd say I feel burned-out in my present CES assignment. 1 2 3 4

2. I consider myself successful in my work, meaning that I am effective and happy, and I'm keeping a growing edge. 1 2 3 4

B. Please indicate answers to your experiences with and assessment of what prevents or deters burn-out:

1. One's degree of burn-out is closely related to one's strength of testimony of the Gospel. 1 2 3 4

2. Those who are most interested in other people are least likely to show signs of burn-out. 1 2 3 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Living Gospel principles, i.e: prayer, scripture study, fasting, service, etc., will deter burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Those who feel challenged in their CES job assignment are less apt to show signs of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Those who enjoy life, and have positive, optimistic attitudes toward life are less likely to evidence signs of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Those who have a consistent program of good diet and exercise are less apt to have feelings of burn-out on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frequent (each 3 to 5 years) transfers and changes in assignment are deterrents to burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Altering job descriptions within existing CES assignments will prevent feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Those with higher total incomes will show less signs of burn-out than will those with lower incomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Having a challenging Church assignment where one feels needed is a deterrent to feeling burned-out on one's job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If one keeps his priorities in order, namely, a) family, b) Church, and c) professional work, he is more likely to curb feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Burn-out on the job can be deterred if one feels success in the home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Hobbies and avocations away from the job are deterrents to burn-out on the job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Being involved in community and civic affairs off the job prevents one from feeling burn-out on the job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A happy marriage is a deterrent to burn-out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Feeling needed in one's CES assignment helps prevent feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments and achievements deters burn-out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A positive relationship with one's line leader is a deterrent to burn-out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. An authoritarian leadership style on the part of a line leader acts as a deterrent to burn-out in the followers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A democratic leadership style on the part of a line leader serves to deter burn-out in those working under his direction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. A laisse-faire leadership style on the part of a line leader contributes to a follower being able to curb feelings of burn-out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Being able to express opinions to line leaders before decisions are made that effect working conditions acts as a deterrent to burn-out for the worker.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Periodic meditation about one's blessings can prove to help prevent job burn-out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Curriculum improvements made by the system are factors helping educators avoid job burn-out.

25. Faculty in-service improvements have been instrumental in deterring educator burn-out on the job.

26. Some sort of merit pay scale to reward the outstanding educator will serve as a deterrent to burn-out.

27. Burn-out is more apt to appear in workers over 45 years old, than in workers under 45 years of age.

28. Maturation of personality appears to be a factor in curbing job burn-out.

C. Select 3 of the 28 factors mentioned in B, preceding, which you think are most significant in deterring burn-out. Please rank them in descending order:

Most significant in deterring burn-out. Item #

1st
2nd
3rd

D. Select 3 of the 28 factors mentioned in B, preceding, which you think are least significant in deterring burn-out. Please rank them in order of least significance to you.

Least significant in deterring burn-out. Item #

1st
2nd
3rd
E. Please include comments concerning deterrents to burn-out in your work with CES that you would like to make, that you feel are not adequately covered by the questionnaire:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much. Please return the completed questionnaire in the attached, pre-addressed, stamped envelope at your earliest convenience after receiving it, to:

Randall V. Douglass
768 East 16th Avenue
Eugene, Oregon 97401
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ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the predictive power of items regarding career appraisal in correctly classifying the status of burnout among Church Education System educators with six to ten years of service. Also, the factors considered most effective as deterents to burnout were determined.

It was found that those who (1) did not feel they were progressing in their careers and (2) would change careers if possible were most likely to report burnout. Feeling needed in one's assignment and being recognized and appreciated for one's accomplishments, besides having a happy marriage, enjoying life, and living Gospel principles, were some of the factors ranked as most significant in deterring burnout.
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