379
N81
No. 6357

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COACHES' LEADERSHIP
STYLE AND BURNOUT**

THESIS

**Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements**

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

**Judith A. Dale, B.A.
Denton, Texas
August, 1987**

Dale, Judith A. Relationship between Coaches' Leadership Style and Burnout. Master of Science (Physical Education), August, 1987, 108 pp., 5 tables, references, 100 titles.

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between leadership behavior and perceived burnout of coaches. Head coaches from high schools and from Southeast and Southwest Conference universities were included in the sample (N=302). Coaches completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Social Desirability Scale and a demographic data sheet. Coaches were separated into two leadership behavior groups and classified as Consideration or as Initiating Structure. It was predicted that coaches in the Consideration Group would have a higher level of perceived burnout. A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted and indicated significant differences in four subscales of the MBI. Specifically, coaches in the Consideration Group scored significantly higher in the frequency and intensity dimension of the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales ($p < .001$).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	vi
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study	
Definitions of Terms	
Limitations	
Delimitations	
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	11
Definition of Burnout	
Measurement of Burnout	
Research on Burnout	
Burnout on Athletic	
Definitions and Measurement of Leadership	
Leadership and Sport	
Burnout and Leadership Style	
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	51
Subjects	
Procedures	

Testing Instruments

IV.	RESULTS	62
	Analysis of Data	
	Descriptive Statistics	
	Leadership Behavior & Burnout	
	Relationship Between Demographic Variables & Perceived Burnout	
V.	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS.	73
	Discussion	
	Conclusions	
	Recommendations	
	APPENDICES	83
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Leadership Behavior and Burnout.....	65
2 Means and Standard Deviations of Burnout Subscales & Leadership Styles.....	66
3 Comparison of Subscales by Gender: Present Study vs. Caccese & Mayerberger (1984)	68
4 Means and Standard Deviations of Burnout Subscales for Demographic Variables.....	70
5 Means and Standard Deviations of Burnout Subscales for Sports.....	71

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure	Page
1. Smith's Interpretation of Thibaut and Kelley's Social Exchange Model as Compared with Burnout.....	29

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Burnout is a concept of work-related stress that causes people to become cynical and exhausted by the job that they are doing. Burnout was first approached in Freudenberger's (1974) article on staff burnout and then expanded to the area of human service or helping professions by Christina Maslach (1976). Maslach approached burnout in terms of situational and environmental factors interacting with individual characteristics. Furthermore, she felt that in the helping professions there were excessive demands placed on an individual's resources, causing stress. Human service and helping professions have been concentrated on due to the close interaction with people under a variety of conditions. How effectively each individual deals with on-the-job stress is related to how each individual treats his or her clients.

Defining burnout has created some problems due to its individuality, but a popular definition is one by Maslach (1976), who described burnout as "a loss of concern for the people with

whom one is working" (p. 16). Maslach and Jackson (1981) then developed the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI). The construction of the instrument was followed by a variety of experiments which consequently have made it the most widely used measurement of burnout. The MBI contains three subscales: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Each subscale is measured in two categories: intensity and frequency.

The literature thus far on burnout has concentrated on work and business settings. Only recently has burnout been considered in an athletic context. This approach has not limited itself just to athletes but also to coaches, trainers, team physicians and teachers. Athletes, in fact, have not been tested to assess if they are burned out or not because there has not been a valid measurement tool. To facilitate research, Smith (1986) proposed a cognitive-affective model of athletic burnout which parallels Thibaut and Kelley's Social Exchange Model (1959). Smith used Thibaut and Kelley's framework to try to differentiate between withdrawal from sport participation due to burnout and withdrawal due to other factors. Smith stresses the need for a sport-specific measure for burnout, epidemiological studies of intensity and frequency, and causal factors contributing to burnout.

Gieck, Brown and Shank (1982) studied burnout among

athletic trainers, and used open ended questions to determine if an individual was experiencing burnout. Caccese and Mayerberger (1984) administered the MBI to college coaches and the results showed a significant gender difference in emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment subscales, with the females scoring higher than the males.

One of the potential correlates of burnout in a coaching situation is leadership behavior. According to Hemphill (1954), "the ability to lead is to engage in an act that initiates a structure in the interaction as a part of the process of solving a mutual problem" (p. 15). Leadership studies conducted by Hemphill (1950 & 1954), Stogdill & Scott (1953) and Stogdill & Coons (1957) have concluded that there are two basic types of leadership behaviors: initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure is characteristic of an individual who is goal oriented and authoritative. Consideration is characteristic of an individual who is human relation oriented and democratic. Leadership behavior has been studied in industrial, educational, military and hospital settings. The conclusions that have been drawn from these studies unfortunately are equivocal. Each type of leadership behavior has been found (in a varying degree) in every leader and some even function well under contradictory settings and situations. The measurement methodology was

developed by Hemphill in 1950 but the revised version in widespread use is Stogdill & Coon's (1957) Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

The studies of leadership behavior moved towards the sport scene because of the definite structure that athletic teams possess. There is a leader (the coach) and followers (the athletes) and the coach exhibits a definite type of leadership behavior. Studies by Fry, Kerr & Lee (1983) have found that leader behavior differs with the type of task. Chelladurai and Carron (1982), Hersey and Blanchard (1969, 1977) and House (1971) found there were changes in preferred leadership behavior as the level of experience or ability increased. Hemphill (1950) found that the size of the group has an effect on leadership behavior and Chelladurai and Carron (1982) found that the type of sport has an effect on the type of leadership behavior that is successful.

A coach whose leadership style is consideration may fall into the category of being burned out as do others who are in human service or helping professions less than a coach whose leadership style is initiating structure. Thus far, however, there have been no studies attempting to relate leadership style to burnout. A comprehensive study which could further define the type or style of leadership behavior which contributes to burnout would

be beneficial in assisting the coaching profession to avoid burn-out.

Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if leadership behavior is related to coaches' perceived burnout.

The secondary purpose of this study was to determine if there is any significant relationship between specific demographic variables such as age, sex, years coached and team coached to perceived burnout.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms will be used throughout the next chapters:

Burnout. The "loss of concern for the people with whom one is working" (Maslach, 1976, p. 16).

Initiating Structure. The factor of initiating structure "is referring to the extent to which a leader initiated activity in the group, organized it, and defined the way work was to be done: insisting on maintaining standards, meeting deadlines, deciding

in detail what is to be done, etc" (Bass, 1981, p. 359).

Consideration. The factor of consideration "is comprised to the extent to which a leader exhibits concern for the welfare of the other members of the group: expressed appreciation for good work, stressed importance of job satisfaction, treating subordinates as equals, putting subordinates suggestions into operation, etc." (Bass, 1981, p. 358).

Leadership Behavior. Leadership is the "behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal" (Hemphill & Coons 1957, p. 7).

Leadership. Leadership is "the process (act) of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement" (Stogdill, 1950, p. 2).

Limitations

This study was subject to all limitations recognized in collecting data by mailed questionnaire.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to high school coaches in Dallas, Ft.

Worth, San Antonio and Houston areas and college coaches in the Southeast and Southwest Conferences. It was also concerned only with the responses of the head coaches.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership--A survey of theory & research. NY: The Free Press.
- Caccese, T. M., & Mayerberger, C. K. (1984). Gender Differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 279-288.
- Chelladuria, P., & Carron, A. V. (1982). Individual & task differences and preferred leadership. Paper presented at NASPSA Conference, College Park, MD.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. Journal of Social Issues, 30, 159-165.
- Fry, J., Kerr, S., & Lee, M. (1983). An extension and test of path goal leadership theory, using athletic teams as research sample. Paper presented at Academy of Management annual meeting, Dallas, TX.
- Gieck, J., Brown, R. S., & Shank, R. H. (1982, Aug.). The Burnout Syndrome Among Athletic Trainers. Athletic Training, pp. 36-41.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950). Leader Behavior Description. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1954). A proposed theory of leadership in small

- groups. Second Preliminary Report. Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board. In R. M. Stodgill (Ed.), (1974). Handbook of Leadership, NY: The Free Press.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire. In R.M. Stodgill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leadership Behavior: its description & measurement. Coumbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969, May). Lifecycle theory of leadership. Training & Development Journal, pp. 26-34.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior. (3rd edition) Prentice-Hall.
- House, R. J. (1971). Path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. Human Behavior, 5, 16-22.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113.
- Smith, R. E. (1986). Toward a Cognitive - Affective Model of Athletic Burnout. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1, 36-50.
- Stodgill, R. M. (1950), Leadership, membership & organization. Psychological Bulletin, 47, 1-4.
- Stodgill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leadership Behavior: its description & measurement. The Ohio State University.
- Stodgill, R. M., & Scott, E.L. (1953) Aspects of Leadership &

Organization. The Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The Social Psychology of Groups NY: Wiley.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of the present investigation was to determine if leadership behavior contributes to perceived burnout of coaches. The two styles of leadership behavior of interest in the present investigation are initiating structure and consideration (Haplin, 1957).

This chapter will discuss the relevant literature related to burnout and leadership behavior. First, the definition and measurement of burnout along with empirical research on the burnout syndrome and the relationship of burnout and athletics will be presented. Next, the definition and measurement of leadership behavior along with empirical research on leadership and sport will be discussed. Finally, the relationship between burnout and leadership behavior in a sport context will be addressed.

Definition of Burnout

The concept of burnout first appeared in Freudenberger's (1974) article on staff burnout. He concentrated on the help-

giving fields and used the term burnout to "denote a state of physical and emotional depletion resulting from conditions of work" (Farber, 1983, p. 1). He developed the term from its psychedelic birth in the drug culture, of being "burned out on drugs," to mean a psychological characteristic of certain volunteers in health care facilities. Freudenberger took a clinical approach to burnout and based his model on a paradigm that relied on case studies and different psychological aspects of the individual. His work focused on the individual's psychological capabilities to deal with a stressful situation, and investigations thus far have concentrated on human service or helping professions due to the endless list of work-related stress. For example, "virtually all human service professionals complain of long hours, isolation, lack of autonomy, client 'neediness,' public misunderstanding of the nature of their work, insufficient resources, lack of criteria to measure accomplishments, excessive demands for productivity, inadequate job training and administrative indifference to or interference with their work" (Farber, 1983, p. 15). In addition to general stress, certain professions such as policemen, attorneys and judges may feel pressured by the impact of their everyday decisions. Teachers, also, have to address the problems of how to deal with irate parents, bad students and

over-crowded classrooms. Coaches have some additional stressors such as high pressure to win and perform, administrative interference and disciplinary problems. In summary the research thus far on burnout suggests two things: an imbalance between resources and demands causing stress and "an immediate, short term, emotional response to this imbalance characterized by feelings of anxiety tension, fatigue and exhaustion" (Cherniss, 1980, p. 17).

Defining burnout in a uniform manner has traditionally been a problem because of its complexity and the inability to easily describe the syndrome. Freudenberger and Richelson (1980), for example, described burnout as "a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward" (p. 13). This in turn is characterized by loss of energy and interest by staff in their jobs. Pines and Aronson (1981) noted that burnout is "characterized by physical depletion, by feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, by emotional drain, and by the development of negative self-concept and negative attitudes toward work, life and other people. . . [It is a] sense of distress, discontent, and failure in the quest for ideals" (p. 15). Their formal definition was that burnout "is constant or repeated emotional pressures asso-

ciated with an intense involvement" (Pines & Aronson, 1981, p. 15). Cherniss (1981) concentrated on motivational changes with his definition of burnout being a "psychological withdrawal from work in response to excessive stress and dissatisfaction" (p. 10). The job that was once great has lost its excitement and turns into a form of drudgery. Thus, Cherniss feels that burnout is an attitudinal and motivational change.

There is general agreement that the burnout syndrome is comprised of a number of components, and its development represents complex interactions producing symptoms in behavioral, emotional, physiological and psychological areas. The burned out individuals may be detached in their treatment and become cynical towards clients. The great amount of time and devotion to one's work loses its charm and challenge resulting in low productivity and tendency to just "go through the motions." In essence, burnout is a disease of overcommitment (Cherniss, 1980). This syndrome also appears not to be a reaction to occasional stress but to a chronic everyday stress; thus it is a process and not just an event or happening. This process makes it even more difficult to identify because it is not identical for each person. "The process takes time to develop and flourishes in an environment characterized by high or continuous levels of stress "

(Patrick, 1981, p. 11). The stressors seldom affect the individual in a unique and specific way but it is usually their interaction that affects the individual (Shaw, Bensky & Dixon, 1981). Mattingly (1977) states that according to his observations "burnout . . . is a subtle pattern of symptoms, behaviors and attitudes that are unique for each person " (p. 13). In addition, burnout may cause an individual to stop work and still others may continue and thus it is difficult to distinguish burnout from turnover. Turnover can be voluntary or involuntary and anticipated or not. Turnover is also different in human service professions because a person may leave his/her job and go onto a similar position instead of leaving the field totally as in burnout. On the other hand, professional burnout is seen by some as almost a "cop-out" to avoid responsibilities or cause harm.

It was Christina Maslach (1976) whose concept of burnout encompassed all the human service occupations. She took an empirical approach to burnout, concentrating on situational and environmental factors interacting with the individual psychologically. Maslach focused her attention on the situation because it is under specific conditions and constraints which the individual is expected to perform. Thus, the situation may have limitations or restrictions due to rules, regulations and procedures which

increase stress. Maslach (1982) felt that such a focus allows for the possibility "that the nature of the job may precipitate burnout and not just the nature of the person performing the job" (p. 9) and therefore she studied burnout in the realm of helping professions because of the excessive external demands that are placed on these individuals.

Maslach (1976) defined burnout as the "loss of concern for the people with whom one is working" (p. 16) in response to stress that is job related. Maslach's definition will be used because it encompasses three important concepts that are relevant to this investigation: 1) the loss of concern or emotional detachment, 2) the effects on the individual and their co-workers and 3) the response to job related stress. Maslach's definition has clarity and specification in stating "a loss of concern" instead of vaguely referring to a pattern of behavioral and additional symptoms.

Measurement of Burnout

The development of a tool to measure burnout has been difficult due to the discrepancies of exactly what influences burnout the most. Jones (1980) developed the Staff Burnout

Scale (SBS) that incorporates behavioral and physiological items along with cognitive and emotional ones. The SBS also includes an index of social desirability because of the answers that might be given due to the social desirability factor to assess the feelings in the work environment towards turnover.

One of the major contributions to the understanding of the burnout syndrome is the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) developed by Maslach and Jackson (1981). The MBI can be used to measure the burnout experienced in human service occupations. They argue that burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do "people work". The three aspects that the MBI concentrates on are emotional exhaustion, cynical attitudes and tendency to evaluate oneself negatively. (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The MBI, which is the most widely used scale, contains three subscales that assess these three aspects of burnout. The emotional exhaustion subscale assesses feelings of being emotionally over extended and exhausted by one's work. This is characterized by the "development of negative attitudes towards one's self, toward work and life" (Pines, 1981, p. 18). The depersonalization subscale measures an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of one's service, care, treatment or instruction.

instruction. Depersonalization is characterized by detached feelings towards recipients and work and the feelings of just going through the motions. The personal accomplishment subscale assesses feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The perception of accomplishment which when low, results in the perception of lack of ability to control situations and situational variables. The MBI confronts burnout with an interactional approach viewing personal characteristics and situational variables as affecting the other. Cherniss (1980) expresses this concept by stating that burnout is a "state of emotional exhaustion related to overload " (p. 16).

The inventory is divided into three different categories because the level of burnout is affected by motivational and attitudinal changes and it is also a stress response to an interaction of environmental and situational factors. This approach has been taken by many researchers who feel that burnout is a situational problem not an individual failure. (Pines, 1981). These individual factors may seem part of the job or trivial but it is a compounding effect of everyday stress that increases the chance or level of burnout. It is important to be conscious of both personal and situational factors.

For this study the research has been concentrated on a

personal factor rather than a situational or environmental variable. The personal factor that will be investigated is the leadership behavior of an individual. This will be discussed in the leadership section. The environment in which leadership behavior was studied is a coaching situation. Since we are concentrating on the personal factor of leadership behavior, Maslach's (1976) definition of burnout, "a loss of concern for whom one is working with" (p. 16) in response to job related stress, is the definition that was used. It must be kept in mind that the leadership behavior is going to be affected by the interaction of environmental and situational stressors that are inherent in coaching. Burnout has also been found to be affected by a variety of situational and environmental factors. We will now examine some of these factors.

Research and Burnout

Burnout has developed into an up and coming issue. In 1977 the federal government studied stress in the work environment and sponsored the Occupational Stress Conference and this stimulated work by others to delve into the causes and effects of burnout, since, "some people are more sensitive to certain sources

of stress or stimulation than others" (Patrick, 1981, p. 30).

Burnout was first labeled as being reflective of McGregor's (1960) "'Theory X' view of management," an authoritarian-moral approach. The basic assumption of Theory X is that "most people dislike work, lack ambition, are essentially passive, avoid responsibility, resist change and are self centered and unconcerned with the needs of an organization " (Carroll & White, 1982, p. 53). Efforts were soon concerned on finding out who exactly burns out. Maslach (1976) concentrated investigations toward the area of human service and helping professions. A variety of occupations in these fields have been studied and a common theme of several articles and research has been teacher burnout. (Landsmann, 1978; Reed, 1979 & Serrin, 1979). For example, Bloch (1976) states that the work environment of teachers is critically important and describes the classroom as "resembling a combat zone" (p. 66). Shinn (1982) found that "many aspects of the work environment can contribute to burn-out" (p. 69). Similarly, Shaw, Bensky and Dixon (1981) list a number of environmental stressors that are inherent to teaching including: confined space, yelling kids, work demands, pressures, job security, existence of deadlines, abrupt and unplanned changes, administrative discrepancies, volume of work and

performance standards.

Along with inherent environmental stress in an occupation, there also can be psychological stressors such as dealing with a client or having to give your "all" in too many situations. These, stressors, may come in the form of anxiety, frustration, anger and fear and are greatly dependent on your own psychological state including needs, goals, wants and expectations. (Shaw, Bensky & Dixon, 1981). An example of psychological and environmental factors having a great effect on the level of burnout is in Maslach and Jackson's (1979) study on police officers. Police officers are "'people-workers' who spend considerable time in close encounters with others under conditions of chronic stress" (p. 59) causing emotional exhaustion. In police work, there are both physical and psychological risks, that are soon brushed off as hazards of the job. It is easy to develop negative or callous feelings towards one's clients, a protective device of sorts that reduces the emotional involvement. The investigation also studied the family and found that high burnout scores of officers were associated with domestic strains that are absent or mild in families with low scores. The families studied indicated that there are different ways of living and coping with a burned out police officer and there are different methods in which they

innoculate themselves against on the job stress. Some of those who find a way to effectively cope with the chronic levels of stress "may become aware of burnout only when they interact with those who are burning out and coping ineffectively " (Patrick, 1981, p. 46). It was concluded that each police officer had to deal with this stress in some way and that the effects that it had on the individual would also affect their family.

Sakharoo and Farber (1983) turned their concern away from the occupation itself and in the direction of preparation for an occupation and the attitudes towards it. They conducted a study of burnout on teachers involving four topics and these topics were posed in question form in an interview type setting. The results of the study found; a) 80% expressed a desire to help and nurture children, b) 30% felt they were poorly prepared; training was unrealistic and theoretical, c) feelings of frustration stemmed from bureaucratic problems and that "67% felt their physical health was adversely affected by their work " (p.73) and d) half of the teachers were considering leaving the profession. (Sakharoo & Farber, 1983). Further research confirmed their findings that burnout was correlated with "poor physical health, sleep problems, amount of alcohol drinking and such on duty symptoms as headaches, loss of appetite, nervousness,

backaches and stomachaches " (Pines, 1981, p. 17). Thus, it is important for an individual to be emotionally, mentally and physically able and prepared for a job since this directly affects the individual in their satisfaction and performance. This satisfaction will also affect turnover.

An empirical study observing social workers in child abuse programs, (Berkely Planning Association, 1977) found that burnout and turnover were significantly correlated ($r=.36$), "thus burnout is associated with worker turnover but is not the same thing" (p. 33). Professionals in social work and rehabilitation services leave jobs at a rate of twice (25-30%) that per year than professionals in nonservice fields (8-15%). (Katzell, Korman & Levine, 1977). Furthermore, burnout has been found negatively correlated with "satisfaction from work, life and oneself and positively correlated with turnover, tardiness and intention to leave a job " (Pines, 1982; Pines & Aronson, 1980, 1981; Pines, 1982 & Maslach, 1978). However, individuals in professional occupations are not the only people to be affected by burnout. We will now discuss burnout and athletics.

Burnout and Athletics

We have now distinguished the differences between burnout and turnover in the human service professions. This aspect has also been addressed in an athletic context by Robinson and Carron (1982). They examined the relationship between personal and situational factors associated with dropping out or maintaining participation in athletics. Personal factors were put into categories of trait measures such as achievement motivation, intrinsic motivation and self esteem. The situational factors, such as support from significant others, coaching and leadership, consideration and cohesiveness of the group, were also categorized. (Robinson & Carron, 1982). Robinson and Carron concentrated their efforts on discovering if these factors had an effect on participation. Participating was put on a continuum, from participating to not participating (dropping out). The results of the study indicated that participation was directly related to personal factors and their perception of specific situational factors. (Robinson & Carron, 1982). The most common reason given for discontinuing participation was "other things to do" and this applied to other sports, hobbies, work or involvements. Since this study used children ages eight through fourteen, most

continued some participation in some sport so their "dropping out" of one sport would not classify them as being burned out.

Most of the studies thus far on burnout have been concerned with professional and work situations. Gieck, Brown and Shank (1982), however, studied burnout among athletic trainers, prompting research in the sport domain. They investigated not only the cause and effects of stress resulting in burnout but the use of modifiers to reduce the effects of stress. They argued that it is stress that causes a gradual deterioration of a person's ability to be productive on the job. The physical signs and symptoms of pressures of decisions, frustration with coaches, exhaustion from long hours can cause the trainer to become less effective and efficient. The physiological signs and symptoms from chronic everyday stress are manifested by an increased pulse rate, headaches, shortness of breath and neuromuscular tension. The quality and quantity of the athletic trainers' work is also reduced when the body shows signs of exhaustion (Gieck, Brown & Shank, 1982). The psychological signs and symptoms are expressed as anxiety, depression, sleeplessness and sometimes sexual dysfunction,(Gieck, Brown & Shank, 1982). This is when a substance dependency may begin with drugs, alcohol or tobacco.

The situation that the athletic trainer works under is also

unusual in the sense that it occurs in a school semester. Gieck, Brown and Shank (1982) felt that the best way to examine the athletic trainer's potential for burnout was "to look at the daily duties and re-examine the time spent on a variety of activities " (p. 39). The solution prescribed to variety of victims of burnout to combat fatigue was to have an active outside life, proper health habits, restructure behavior and analyze job stress.

(Gieck, Brown & Shank, 1982). Along with examining daily habits, being able to control one's environment is equally important. Along these lines the author felt that the ability that one has to organize is frequently part of the problem. In addition, the investigators felt that the athletic trainers could reorganize and re-examine a variety of factors in their life and work to reduce the level of burnout by decreasing the amount of stress.

In the first empirical study of burnout in the coaching profession, Caccese and Mayerberger (1984) studied gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. College coaches seem to be prime candidates for burnout due to the stressful environment they must function under, the multitude of different types of people they have to deal with and the variety of different roles they fulfill. With the increasing number of females joining the coaching profession, the question was

raised concerning differences between male and female coaches, in terms of perceived burnout. A random sample of 375 NCAA and AIAW Division I college coaches was used and the coaches completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Results revealed the "female coaches reported higher ratings on both the emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment subscales than did the male coaches. On both of these subscales the frequency and intensity of these reported feelings was significantly different in male and female " (Caccese & Mayerberger, 1984, p. 282). Depersonalization did not differ significantly between the two genders. Caccese and Mayerberger's (1984) results, when compared with normative data, showed that neither sex was excessively burned out. One item of interest was the quantity, (frequency dimension) with the female coaches scoring one full unit lower than the norm on the personal accomplishment subscale. Therefore it was concluded that "female coaches feel far less personal accomplishment than do female health and service professional " (Caccese & Mayerberger, 1984, p. 284). The females were also found to be younger and have coached fewer years. This seems to go along with the logical progression of burnout because the men scored lower than the females did on the level of perceived burnout. The men who were burned out may have already

stopped coaching, leaving the men who have found effective ways to deal with stress.

Caccese and Mayerberger (1984) suggested a variety of reasons for their findings. First, female coaches have fewer years of coaching behind them so they are presumably less experienced and have had less opportunity to learn to cope. Second, they feel more stress because they are trying harder to prove that female athletic teams can perform well and do deserve respect. Third, the female coaches are too idealistic, expecting too much and it is these unrealistic aspirations that are multiplied by few visible results that increase the burnout rate. (Caccese & Mayerberger, 1984 & Kehl, 1981). However, one then could also argue that burnout is cumulative, a long term result of stress over time so females should be less burned out.

The studies have all had a central theme of how burnout affects individuals, but it was Smith (1986) who devised a theoretical framework. Smith (1986) has developed a cognitive-affective model of stress to parallel the different components of burnout. (see Figure 1) He uses the framework of Thibaut and Kelley's Social Exchange Model (1959) to differentiate between withdrawal from an activity due to burnout and withdrawal from an activity due to other reasons. The social

FIGURE I

Smith's Interruption of Thibaut and Kelley's Social Exchange Model as Compared to burnout

exchange model is utilized due to the assumption that human behavior is governed primarily by the desire to maximize positive experiences and to minimize the negative ones (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). The positive experiences were favorable consequences such as achievement of goals, feeling of competence and mastery, affiliation with others, approval from significant others and tangible rewards such as trophies, money, prizes and clothing. The negative experiences ranged from feelings of failure, depression, lack of control, feelings of incompetence and waste of time and effort. Thibaut and Kelley believed that an individual will continue the activity depending on the outcome, which is evaluated by the comparison level for an alternative activity. The alternative activity can range from changing jobs, taking up a new career to doing nothing. This comparison level is based on past experiences, observations of others and momentary need states ranging on a scale from pleasant to unpleasant. But this alone does not determine if an individual will continue participation since the comparison level for alternatives must also be considered. Any opportunity that falls below the comparison level of an alternative will then be discontinued.

Smith's model illustrates the variety of contributing factors in burnout considering not only factors of participation motivation

but also nonparticipation motivational factors that lower the outcome below the comparison level for alternatives. These factors such as fear of failure and excessive time and energy demands are stress-inducing. But as the results from Robinson and Carron's (1982) study indicated, the reason for discontinuing participation was interest in other activities. The other activities had a higher outcome when compared to the present activity.

The definitions that we have been concerned with the burn-out syndrome incorporate a relationship among situational, cognitive, physiological and behavioral components. The situational component in burnout occurs when the environmental demands exceed personal and situational resources causing stress due to overload. Coaches have filled the roles of administrators, disciplinarians, managers, parents, psychologist and friends. Many coaches also are required to teach classes and many even have to coach another sport. The opposite, underload, can also take place when an individual is bored and not challenged to use his or her resources. The cognitive component is also extremely important in understanding the nature and intensity of the stress response. In essence, it involves an appraisal process that is derived from the individual's belief system that creates the re-

sponse whether appropriate or inappropriate. Each individual coach deals with a disruptive athlete in a different way. An example of the physiological component occurs when there is the threat of danger or emergency which produces a physiological arousal to deal with the situation. The intensity of the arousal indicates the amount of stress. The behavioral component is exhibited and shows how the situation is going to be dealt with. Not only does one component affect another component but all four of them are affected by motivational and personality variables. This makes burnout very individualized and hard to predict.

From the potential factors contributing to burnout, one factor will be isolated, leadership behavior, to determine if there is any relationship with perceived burnout. Leadership behavior was chosen for a variety of reasons; the ease of measurement, the ability to distinguish between the two types of leadership styles (initiating structure and consideration) and because it is a personal attribute or factor. Smith emphasized how personal factors have a great deal of impact on the level of burnout. The coaching situation was chosen because of the lack of data that has been collected and it is also a situation that leadership is readily displayed. We will discuss research on the definition and measurement of leadership.

Definitions and Measurement of Leadership

Many definitions of leadership have appeared in the literature as most researchers have tried to identify specific qualities or characteristics of an individual behavior which can be recognized as leadership. For example, Stogdill (1959) defines leadership as "the initiation and maintenance of structure in expectation and interaction. . . "(p. 15). The leader of a group has been identified by Homans (1950) as the one who "originates interaction." Investigations concentrating on leadership have established it on a behavioral continuum from consideration to initiating structure. For example, Parten (1933) considers leadership "not a single trait possessed either to a maximum degree or not at all, but, rather, a quality which is present in varying quantities " (p. 430). Leadership has also been defined by placing the emphasis on the group or team that is being led. "A leader is an individual who is moving in a particular direction. . . ." (p. 145), is the definition that Cowley (1928) provides. Hemphill (1954) furthers Cowley's definition by continuing ". . . who succeeds in including others to follow him " (p. 15).

But other investigators do not believe that leadership is a

characteristic or quality of an individual but takes on the role of a particular individual in a social situation. (Pigors, 1935). Along these lines, several studies have pointed out the importance of the social situation and Stogdill (1959) concluded that many of the qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined basically by the situational demands that he must function as the leader.

Hemphill (1954) combined the characteristics of a social situation and the individual's personality to define leadership "as the ability to lead is to engage in an act that initiates a structure in the interaction as a part of the process of solving a mutual problem" (p. 309). This definition encompasses the characteristics that we are trying to identify: a leader or the style that a leader exhibits. It also combines two major ideas in leadership: 1) that the leader initiates the structure of the group and 2) that there needs to be some consideration involved that leads to solving a mutual problem.

In recent years, there has been a great number of studies investigating leadership behavior. The studies have tried to determine the leadership style that leads to the highest productivity, job satisfaction, group effectiveness, group cohesion and goal achievement. The University of Michigan Survey

Research Center was working toward the specific purpose of determining "... principles which contribute both to the productivity of the group and the satisfaction that the group members derive from their participation" (Likert, 1950, p. iii). These researchers were concerned with identifying behavior that was universally exhibited by leaders in a variety of different situations. Studies in the area have narrowed down their conclusions and found two basic areas of leadership behavior: initiation of structure, which is characteristic of an authoritarian person, and consideration, which is characteristic of a person-oriented, human relation individual.

Fiedler (1967) took an interactional approach to study leadership and proposed the Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. This model parallels other leadership measurements because it measures two types of leadership behavior: task oriented (initiating structure) and interpersonally oriented (consideration). Fiedler measures the leadership behavior dimensions separately with the Least Preferred Coworker (LPC) and the Most Preferred Coworker (MPC). This model differs from others because it takes into consideration the situation and its favorability. The proposition of Fiedler's theory is that "task oriented (initiating structure) leaders will be more effective in

both the least and most favorable situations, whereas the interpersonally oriented (consideration) leaders will be more effective in moderately favorable situations " (Fiedler, 1967, p. 147). This model is difficult to test, however, due to the lack of differences in situational favorability. But Fiedler was one of the first researchers to concentrate his efforts on the fact that personal and situational factors interact together causing a final product, one does not cause the other.

The measurement scale that will be used in the present study was developed by the Ohio State Leadership Studies staff called the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Their studies determined that initiating structure and consideration were the two factors which had the strongest intercorrelation (Hemphill, 1950b). The LBDQ has been revised numerous times. The 'ideal' and 'real' forms of the LBDQ were developed by Hemphill, Seigel and Westies (1974) to measure not just the actions a leader exhibits but the expectations of what a leader ought to do. It was developed due to discrepancies between worker's observations and description of leader's behavior and the leaders description of their behavior. However some researchers felt that leadership could not be described by just two factors. For example, Halpin and Croft (1966) developed four

factors: a) aloofness (formality and social distance), b) production emphasis (pushing for results), c) thrust (personal hard work and task structure) and d) consideration (concern for comfort and welfare of followers). These four factors were used to describe leader's behavior of school principals while four more were used to describe the teachers leadership behavior: a) disengagement (clique formation, withdrawal), b) hindrance (frustration from routine and overwork), c) esprit (high morale, enthusiasm) and d) intimacy (mutual liking and teamwork).

Stogdill (1963) agreed with Halpin and Croft that more than two factors must be used to describe leader behavior. He researched factors such as persuasiveness, tolerance of freedom, integration and predictive accuracy, to name a few. Saris (1969) and Yukl (1971) produced additional subscales to accompany the ones Stogdill had listed. They were responsibility, deference and decision centralization.

One reason the LBDQ (Stogdill & Coons, 1957) is utilized is due to its simplicity and ease of determining which type of leadership behavior an individual demonstrates: either initiating structure and consideration. This personal factor will then be correlated with the level of burnout, since the leadership style has a great impact on one's emotional state and affects how an

individual handles and deals with a situation. Leadership behavior is affected by the situation that an individual is in, and one of these situations is coaching. The next section will discuss leadership behavior and sport.

Leadership and Sport

A multidimensional model of leadership was presented by Chelladurai (1978) to try to incorporate not just the personal characteristics of the leaders and the situational characteristics that we have discussed, but also environmental demands and subordinate's characteristics. Chelladurai considered the leadership of a coach since it is felt that leadership has a direct influence on the athlete and it is important to study the different types of leadership behavior that coaches exhibit. Chelladurai's (1984) reasoning behind this was that the study of leadership is critical to the understanding of sport performance because leadership is instrumental in enhancing the motivational state of the athlete and/or team. The multidimensional model has three essentials: the coach, the athlete and the situation. The leader behavior has three states: the preferred behavior, what the athlete wants the coach to do; the required behavior, what the

situation dictates; and the actual behavior, what the coach does. The required and preferred behaviors have an influence on the coaches actual behavior and how much of an influence will determine the performance and satisfaction of the coaches action. (Chellaurai, 1978). Chelladurai and Saleh (1978) also studied leadership behavior in an athletic setting using Chelladuria's multidimensional scale. It was used to measure the preferred leader behavior. The results paralleled Danielson et al (1975) study in the behavioral dimensions of training, social support and recognition. The factors of autocratic and democratic behavior were the preferred styles.

After considering the type of leadership preferred by the athlete, researchers turned their interest towards the athlete. Researchers have hypothesized that the greater the ability of the athlete, the less the athlete would prefer instruction and training type of leadership (initiating structure). (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969, 1977; House, 1971). The hypothesis has not been tested yet, but Chelladurai and Carron (1982) used 'experience' as a surrogate measure of ability and their results were not consistent with the theoretical predictions. They found that experienced athletes preferred social support, whereas in

Erle's (1981) article he concluded that competitive experience was positively related to a preference for training, instruction and social support. Researchers moved on to study situational factors that might affect preferred leadership such as nature of task, size of team and organizational goals. For example Chelladurai and Carron (1982) found athletes playing team sports preferred training and instruction more than athletes playing individual sports. Open sports such as basketball preferred more training and instruction while closed sports such as diving preferred it less.

The coaches' behavior comes from their personality, experience, ability and motivation which interacts with the situation. Fry, Kerr and Lee (1983) found that perceived leader behavior changed with the task. Specifically, in sports such as basketball, volleyball and football, that are interdependent sports, coaches that were rated high in coordinating, exercising leadership and emphasis on production were perceived as being successful (initiating structure). Sports such as swimming, golf and wrestling are considered independent sports, and coaches who easily maintain a closely knit group and resolve conflicts were perceived as more successful (consideration).

Burnout and Leadership Style

When focusing on leadership, numerous variables must be taken into consideration before a statement about leadership is made. Studies (Erle, 1981; Fiedler, 1967; Fry, Kerr & Lee, 1983 & House, 1971) have concluded that since initiating structure and consideration leadership behaviors can function effectively in similar situations, it becomes difficult to study. We are going to use leadership style in determining the level of perceived burnout of coaches. The information that has been gathered on burnout leads to the conclusion that individuals who are in human services burn out faster than those in nonhuman services. Individuals in the human services also tend to be interpersonally oriented (consideration). So it is felt that coaches who are high in consideration will tend to burn out faster or score higher than those who are high in initiating structure. These coaches will tend to get more emotionally involved with their athletes, become more driven to produce a winning team and have their athlete perform well. Similarly, McPherson (1972) described "how older teachers in a public school influence the newer ones to emphasize order and maintain control in their

classrooms."(p. 21). These teachers being high initiating structure would seem more likely to burn out slower than those high in consideration. This would explain why they are "older teachers". They have continued teaching because they are not burned out and are able to cope with these stressors. Maslach and Jackson (1981) found that as age increases, high scores on burnout inventories decreases. The teachers who are still teaching and who emphasize order and control (initiating structure) burn out less than those who are interpersonally oriented (consideration).

Since no studies have been conducted testing the relationship between leadership style and perceived burnout in coaches, this was the major focus of the present study. This study attempted to determine if there is any difference in perceived level of burnout when compared with a coach's leadership behavior.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Berkeley Planning Associates, (1977). Evaluation of child abuse and neglect demonstration projects, 1974-1977. IX Project management and worker burnout. US Department of Commerce (NTIS No. PB-278 446). Springfield, VA: National Technical Information Service (NCHSR 78-22).
- Bloch, A. (1976). The battered teacher. Today's Education, 66, 58-62.
- Caccese, T. M., & Mayerberger C. K. (1984). Gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 279-288.
- Carroll, J. F. X., & White, W. L. (1982). Theory Building Integrating Individual and Environmental Factors within an Ecological Framework. In W. S. Paine (Ed.) Job Stress and Burnout. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers, 41-60.
- Chelladuria, P. (1978). A multidimensional model of leadership. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univeristy of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario.
- Chelladuria, P. (1984). Discrepancy between preferences and preceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 27-41.

- Chelladuria, P., Carron, A. V. (1982). Task characteristics and individual differences, and their relationship to preferred leadership. Paper presented at NASPSPA Conference, College Park, MD.
- Chelladuria, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sport. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 3, 85-97.
- Cherniss, C. (1980). Staff Burnout: Job Stress in the Human Services. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Cherniss, C. (1981). Trends to watch: Historical, political, social and economic. In W. S. Paine (Ed.) Proceedings of the First National Conference of Burnout. Philadelphia, PA.
- Cowley, W. H. (1928). Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders. Journal of Applied and Social Psychology, 23, 144-157.
- Danielson, R. P., Zelhart, P. F., & Drake, C. J. (1975). Multidimensional scaling and factor analysis of coaching behavior as perceived by high school hockey players. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 46, 323-334.
- Erle, F. J. (1981). Leadership in competitive and recreational sport. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.
- Farber, B. A. (1983) Introduction: A critical Prespective on Burnout. Stress and Burnout in the human service

- professions. NY: Pergamon Press.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff Burnout. Journal of Social Issues, 30, 159-165.
- Freudenberger, H. J. with Richelson, G. (1980). Burnout: The high cost of high achievement. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Fry, J., Kerr, S., & Lee, M. (1983). An extension and test of path goal leadership theory, using athletic teams as research sample. Paper presented at Academy of Management annual meeting, Dallas, TX.
- Gieck, J., Brown, R. S., & Shank, R. H. (1982, August). The Burnout Syndrome Among Athletic Trainers. Athletic Training, pp. 36-41.
- Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1966). The organizational climate of schools. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.) Theory and research in administration. NY: Macmillan.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950a). Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of "superior" leaders. Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 11-22.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950b). Leader behavior description. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

- Hemphill, J. K. (1954). A Proposed theory of leadership in small groups. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board, Technical Report, (unpublished) in R.M. Stogdill (1977). Leadership abstracts and Bibliography 1904-1974. College of Administrative Science in the Ohio State University.
- Hemphill, J. K., Seigel, A., & Westie, C. W. (1974). An exploratory study of relations between perceptions of leader behavior, group characteristics and expectations concerning the behavior of ideal leaders. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board, Unpublished report. In R. M. Stogdill (Ed.) Handbook fo Leadership -- A survey of theory and rese-
search. NY: The Free Press.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969, May). Lifecycle theory of leadership. Training & Development Journal, pp. 26-34.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organiz-
ational behavior. (3rd edition) Prentice-Hall.
- Homans, G. C. (1950). The Human Group. NY: Harcourt, Brace.
- House, R. J. (1971). Path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16,321-323.
- Jones, J. W. (1980). The Staff Burnout Scale for Health Profes-
sionals. Park Ridge, IL: London House Press.

- Katzell, R. A., Korman, A. K., & Levine, E. L. (1977). Research Report #1: Overview of the dynamics of worker job mobility. National Study of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Service (SRS), 72-05401, November.
- Kehl, D. G. (1981, November). Burnout: The risk of reaching too high. Christianity Today, 26, 26-28.
- Landsmann, L. (1978, April). Is teaching hazardous to your health? Instructor, pp. 49-50.
- Likert, R. (1950). Forward In Productivity, Supervision and morale in an office situation. University of Michigan Studies Research Center.
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. Human Behavior, 5, 16-22.
- Maslach, C. (1978). Burn-out: How people cope. Public Welfare, 36, 56-58.
- Maslach, C. (1982). Burning out: The emotional cost of caring. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1979, May). Burned-Out Cops & Their Families. Psychology Today, pp. 59-62.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113.
- Mattingly, M. A. (1977). Symposium: Stress & Burnout in childcare. Childcare, 6, 85-89.

- McGregor, D. (1960). The Human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McPherson, G. H. (1972). Small Town Teacher. Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.
- Paine, W. S. (1982). Job Stress & Burnout: Research, Theory, and Intervention Perspectives. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Partens, M. B. (1933). Leadership among Preschool Children Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 27, 430-440.
- Patrick, P. K. S. (1981). Health Care Workers Burnout, What it is, What to do about it. Chicago, IL: Inquiry Books.
- Pigors, P. J. W. (1935). Leadership or Domenation. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Pines, A. M. (1980, April). Burnout: A current problem in pediatrics. Current Problems in Pediatrics.
- Pines, A. M. (1982). Helper's motivation and the burnout syndrome. In T.A. Wills (Ed.) Basic Processes in helping relationships. NY: Academnic Press.
- Pines, A. M., & Aronson, E. (1980). From Burnout to Personal Growth. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Montreal, Canada.
- Pines, A. M., Aronson, E. with Kafry, D. (1981). Burnout: From Tedium to personal growth. New York: The Free Press.

- Reed, S. (1970). Teacher Burnout: a growing Hazard. New York Times. Feb. 6, pp. A2.
- Robinson, T. T., & Carron, A. V. (1982). Personal & Situational Factors Associated with Dropping Out vs Maintaining Participation in Competitive Sport. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 364-378.
- Sakharoo, M., & Farber, B. A. (1983). A critical study of burnout in Teachers. In B. A. Farber (Ed.) Stress and Burnout in the Human Service Professions. NY: Pergamon, 65-81.
- Saris, R. J. (1969). The development of a 13th subscale to the LBDQ-Form XII entitled "Responsibility Deference". University of Idaho, Doctoral dissertation.
- Serrin, W. (1979). NEA says teachers burnout causes thousands to leave jobs. New York Times. July 6, pp. A8.
- Shaw, S. F., Bensky, J. M., & Dixon, B. (1981). Stress & Burnout a Primer for Special Education and Special Service Personnel. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Shinn, M. (1982). Methodological Issues Evaluation and Using Information. In W. S. Paine (Ed.) Job Stress & Burnout. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers, 61-79.
- Smith R. E. (1986). Toward a Cognitive - Affective Model of Athletic Burnout. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1, 36-50.

- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader Behavior: its description. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963). Manual for the LBDQ - Form XII. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader behavior: its description & measurement. The Ohio State University.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The Social Psychology of Groups. NY: Wiley.
- Yukl, G. A. (1971). Toward a behavioral theory of leadership. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6, 414-440.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

Subjects were high school and college, male and female coaches from private and public schools. The high school coaches were from Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio and Houston. (N=400) The college coaches were from the Southwest and Southeast Division I NCAA Conferences. (N= 180).

Procedures

From each school, the athletic director or principal was contacted by telephone, informed of the study, and asked to provide the information of how many sports and head coaches are at his/her school. A folder was sent to the individual contacted including an introductory letter (Appendix A-high school or B-college) addressed to them and the questionnaires (Appendix C, D, E, & F). An extra set of questionnaires was included in each folder in case of error or loss. Each head coach from each school was to be included in the study and each received an envelope with the

questionnaires and stamped return envelope. The questionnaires were anonymous to ensure complete confidentiality. It was estimated that each high school had seven to thirteen head coaches, covering basketball for males and females, football for males, volleyball for females, baseball for males, golf for males and females, soccer for males and females and track and field for males and females. It was estimated that each college had thirteen to twenty head coaches. NCAA Division I rules require each school to field 8 teams for men and women to maintain its classification as a Division I school.

In order to insure an adequate sample, approximately 580 questionnaires were mailed with a minimum return rate of 50%. The high school sample were from of four major cities in Texas. The sample was taken from both public and private schools and male and female coaches, hoping to exclude any sampling bias. The questionnaires were mailed November 23, 1986.

Four weeks after the questionnaires were sent a follow up letter were mailed to the principal or athletic director. The letter indicated that the completed questionnaires had not yet been received and that their return would be most helpful in completing the research.

Testing Instruments

Maslach Burnout Inventory (Appendix C)

The Maslach Burnout Inventory contains three subscales; emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishment. Each statement is rated on two dimensions: 1) frequency, in which, the scale ranges from 0 ("never") to 6 ("every-day") and 2) intensity, in which, the scale ranges from 0 ("never") to 7 ("major, very strong") (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The correlations between the frequency and intensity dimensions across individual items range from .35 to .75 with a mean of .56. The results suggest a moderate relationship between "how often one experiences various feelings and how intensely they are felt " (Maslach & Jackson, 1981.) Research by Gann (1979) and Maslach and Jackson (1982) found that frequency and intensity sometimes reveal different patterns of correlations with situational and personality variables.

There are nine items in the Emotional Exhaustion subscales, the item with the highest loading factor(.84 on frequency and .81 on intensity) refers directly to burnout, "I feel burned out from my work " (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). There are five items

in the Depersonalization subscale with a high score corresponding to a higher degree of burnout being experienced. There are eight items in the Personal Accomplishment subscale. A lower score in this subscale corresponds to a higher level of burnout being experienced.

The reliability coefficients for the three subscales are reported by Maslach as .90 (frequency) and .76 (intensity) for the emotional exhaustion subscale, .79 (frequency) and .76 (intensity) for the personal accomplishment subscale and .71 (frequency) and .73 (intensity) for depersonalization subscale. (Maslach, 1981). The validity for the MBI was demonstrated in three ways. First, an individual's MBI score was correlated with behavioral ratings made independently by persons who knew the individual well (i.e., spouse or co-worker). Second, MBI scores were correlated with the presence of certain characteristics that were expected to contribute to burnout experienced. Third, MBI scores were correlated with measures of various outcomes that have been hypothesized as related to burnout. All three sets of correlations provided evidence for the validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981a & b). Still with these figures, the different subscales of the MBI are not highly intercorrelated, and they have somewhat "different patterns of correlations with other criteria

suggesting once again the importance of specifying what is being discussed in burnout research " (Shinn, 1982).

The normative data presented in the manual for the MBI (see Appendix G) does not separate groups into occupations; rather, people in a variety of health and service occupations are included (police officers, nurses, agency administrators, teachers, counselors, social workers, probation officers, mental health workers, physicians, psychologists and psychiatrists, attorneys and others) (Caccese & Mayerberger, 1984). The items are in the form of statements about personal feelings and attitudes.

Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Appendix D)

It was Hemphill (1950a) who developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which in its earliest form was 150 questions and eight categories. Stogdill and Coons (1957) revised and shortened the form to thirty questions and two categories: consideration and initiating structure. [Form XII-LBDQ (short form)] The revised edition yields much higher reliability than Hemphill's first version. Stogdill and Scott (1953) found the average reliability of the LBDQ above .65. The description of consideration and initiating structure by leaders are highly stable and consistent from situation to situation (Talyor, Crook &

Dropkin, 1961). It was concluded by Halpin and Winer (1957) that the reliabilities of consideration and initiating structure were satisfactorily high for partial use and that the scales were independent enough to measure different kinds of behavior. The split-half reliability that was found by Halpin (1955) to be .83 and .92 for initiating structure and consideration respectively. Schriesheim and Kerr (1974) found that the LBDQ does maintain high internal consistency that ranges from .7 to more than .8. Some researchers have reported that the LBDQ suffers from leniency response bias that creates a halo effect of favorable and possibly untrue items (Seeman, 1957; Schriesheim, Kinicki & Schriesheim, 1979). The LBDQ has been validated by an unusual way of using actors to play subordinate and superior and observers were asked to describe the supervisors behavior using the LBDQ. Each role was played by two actors. There were no significant differences found between two different actors playing the same role (Stogdill, 1969).

Demographic Data Sheet (Appendix E)

The demographic data sheet contains questions gathering information such as age, sex, years coached, sport coached and level of education. These specific variables will be correlated to the

levels of perceived burnout and type of leadership style.

Maslach and Jackson found that females scored higher on the emotional exhaustion subscale, individuals that were single and thirty and under scored higher than others on the MBI, and individuals that were highly educated scored higher on the emotional exhaustion subscale (Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Crowne - Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Appendix F)

A social desirability scale has been included along with the other questionnaires because "personality test scores are influenced by non-test-relevant response determinants " (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960, p. 349). A variety of attempts have been made to make a distinction between a response that was attributable to what is socially desirable or a genuine presence or absence of such feelings (Meehl & Hathaway, 1946 and Cronbach, 1946, 1950). After studying social desirability scales of Edwards' (1957) and Talyor (1953), Crowne & Marlowe's Social Desirability Scale (1960) was choosen. It appeared to avoid ambiguities of the other scales that took a statistical deviance approach. The internal consistency coefficient was .88 with a test-retest correlation of .89 which seemed more than adequate.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Caccese, T. M., & Mayerberger, C. K. (1984). Gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 279-288.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1946). Response sets and test validity. Educational Psychological Measurement, 6, 475-494.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1950). Further evidence on response sets and test design. Educational Psychological Measurement, 10, 3-31.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.
- Edwards, A. L. (1957). The Social Desirability in personality assesement and research. NY: Dryden.
- Gann, M. L. (1979). The role of personality factors and job characteristics in burnout: A study of social service workers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Halpin, A. W. (1955). The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders. Havard Educational Review, 25, 18-22.

- Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leader Behavior: its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950). Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of "superior" leaders. Journal of Social Psychology, 3, 11-22.
- Maslach, C. (1981). Burnout: A Social Psychological Analysis. In J.W. Jones (Ed.) The Burnout Syndrome. Park Ridge, IL: London House Management Press.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). Maslach Burnout Inventory - Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1982). Burnout in health professions: A social psychological analysis. In G. Sanders & J. Suls (Eds.) Social Psychology of Health & Illness. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Meehl, P. E., & Hathaway, S. R. (1946). The K Factor as a suppressor variable in MMPI. Journal of Applied Psychology, 30, 525-564.

- Schriesheim, C. A., & Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric Properties of the Ohio State Leadership Scale. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 756-765.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Kinicki, A. J., & Schriesheim, J. F. (1979). The effect of leniency on leader behavior descriptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23, 1-29.
- Seeman, M. (1957). A comparison of general and specific leader behavior descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leader Behavior: its description & measurements. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Shinn, M. (1982). Methodological Issues Evaluation and Using Information. In W. S. Paine (Ed.) Job Stress & Burnout. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers, 61-79.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1969). Validity of leader behavior description Personnel Psychology, 22, 153-158.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader Behavior: its description & measurement. The Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Scott, E. L. (1953). Aspects of Leadership & Organization. The Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

Talyor, M., Crook, R., & Dropkin, S. (1961). Assessing emerging leadership behavior in small discussion groups. Journal of Educational Psychology, 52,12-18.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter is organized into the following sections. First, descriptive statistics are provided for the demographic variables of the coaches in the sample. Second, the relationship between leadership behavior and perceived burnout is examined. Third, the relationship between the demographic variables and perceived burnout is presented.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the demographic variables of the coaches revealed the following profile. Of all the coaches (N=302), 77% (N=232) were male and 23% (N=69) were female with the mean age of the sample being 38.9 years old. Most of the coaches were married (69%) and only 23% are single. The coaches have been at their present coaching positions for about seven years (M=7.2) and has been in the coaching profession for approximately fourteen years (M=14.5). In addition to this general profile, most of the coaches had some postgraduate

education with 44% having earned a graduate degree and 30.7% with some postgraduate work. The coaches in this sample spend an average of 40 to 49 hours a week coaching their athletes. The sample represents coaches from twelve sports with the majority of the coaches from football (20.3%), basketball (17.3%) and track & field (10%). Public high schools employed the vast majority of the coaches in this sample (59%) with 10% of the coaches coming from private high schools, 22% from state colleges and 8% from private colleges. Coaches also responded to questions referring to how successful or unsuccessful they felt they were in a variety of areas on an 11 point scale. Coaches rated themselves as pretty successful ($M=8.0$) as a coach and fairly successful in dealing with their athletes ($M=8.90$). The question which asked the coaches to respond to win/loss percentage was not included in the analysis because only 41% of those who returned questionnaires responded to the question. Finally, coaches felt less pressure to win from outside sources ($M=5.35$) than they pressured themselves to win ($M=8.28$). The overall return rate was 56% with a similar percentage returned from private and public high schools and colleges. This ensured a representative sample of coaches from different types of educational institutions.

Leadership Behavior and Burnout

Leadership style was determined by coaches scores on the LBDQ. The coaches who scored in the upper one-third (above 40) on consideration and the lower one-third (below 43) on initiating structure were classified as consideration (N=35) while coaches who scored in the upper one-third (above 48) on initiating structure and the lower one-third (below 36) on consideration were classified as initiating structure (N=30). Multivariate analysis of variance was conducted using the six subscales of the MBI. Results indicated an overall multivariate main effect for leadership style, $F(6,59)=7.00, p<.001$. Univariate analysis of variance indicated significant differences on the subscales of emotional exhaustion frequency $F(1,63)=43.37, p<.001$, depersonalization frequency, $F(1,63)=15.54, p<.001$, emotional exhaustion intensity, $F(1,63)=22.93, p<.001$ and depersonalization intensity $F(1,63)=11.14, p<.001$. The direction of the differences indicated that the consideration coaches were significantly higher than the initiating structure coaches on all subscales. (see Table 1).

Discriminant function analysis was employed to further examine the relationship between leadership behavior and the

subscales of perceived burnout. Results indicated that the four subscales that most discriminated between leadership groups were emotional exhaustion frequency (.97), depersonalization frequency (.58), emotional exhaustion intensity (.71) and depersonalization intensity (.50).

TABLE 1
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR & BURNOUT

Subscale	Initiating Structure		Consideration	
<u>Frequency Dimension</u>	M	SD	M	SD
Emotional Exhaustion	10.00	6.00	24.80	10.96
Depersonalization	4.00	4.02	9.23	6.23
Personal Accomplishment	38.70	7.34	38.03	4.57
<u>Intensity Dimension</u>				
Emotional Exhaustion	17.33	12.55	31.40	11.14
Depersonalization	6.40	6.68	12.40	7.51
Personal Accomplishment	43.00	6.89	42.31	5.76

Note: High scores on Personal Accomplishment indicates less burnout.

Demographic variables were analyzed for coaches in the Consideration Group and the Initiating Structure Group. (see Table 2 for M's & SD's). There were no significant differences between the two leadership behavior groups and the variables of sex, marital status, level of education, type of school and sport coached.

Relationship Between Demographic Variables & Perceived Burnout

The secondary purpose of the present investigation was designed to determine if leadership behavior and other demographic variables are related to coaches perceived burnout as defined by the Maslach Burnout Inventory. First, it should be noted that consistent with previous research (Caccese & Mayerberger, 1984; Capel, 1986, Haggerty, 1982 and Wilson, Haggerty & Bird, 1986), it was found that the coaches were not excessively burned out. Compared to individuals in the helping professions coaches on the average scored lower than the norm. As compared to coaches in Caccese and Mayerberger's (1984) study, the present investigation found the male coaches slightly more burned out and the female coaches were about the same. (See Table 3). The coaches also exhibited a higher feeling of personal

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF BURNOUT SUBSCALES AND LEADERSHIP STYLE

<u>Sex</u>	N	<u>Frequency</u>			<u>Intensity</u>		
		Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization	Personal Accomplishment	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization	Personal Accomplishment
Male	45	18.00(12.66)	7.49(6.12)	38.64(5.62)	23.89(14.16)	10.31(7.62)	42.80(6.52)
Female	20	17.90(9.25)	5.30(5.12)	37.65(6.78)	27.20(12.56)	8.10(7.82)	42.25(5.80)
<u>Marital Status</u>							
Single	19	20.10(12.50)	6.68(5.92)	35.52(6.37)	29.15(14.10)	9.63(7.96)	42.16(5.30)
Married	40	17.67(11.61)	6.80(6.00)	39.42(5.58)	23.87(13.57)	9.70(7.46)	43.02(6.27)
Divorced	6	13.16(8.65)	7.33(6.18)	40.00(4.89)	18.33(10.65)	9.16(9.74)	41.50(9.56)
<u>Education</u>							
Some College	3	22.66(15.50)	10.66(7.09)	41.66(2.88)	29.33(17.01)	14.66(10.06)	48.00(2.64)
College	15	16.06(8.37)	6.80(1.14)	35.46(6.88)	24.86(13.53)	10.26(6.81)	39.53(5.85)
Some postgrad.	24	18.33(12.35)	7.00(1.19)	39.83(5.73)	24.70(13.60)	9.66(7.50)	43.37(6.68)
Postgrad	23	18.36(13.03)	6.04(1.47)	38.45(5.36)	24.63(14.67)	8.36(8.50)	43.36(5.87)
<u>School</u>							
Private H.S.	4	15.75(9.42)	3.00(2.44)	37.75(5.85)	29.50(16.36)	6.75(5.73)	43.25(2.98)
Public H.S.	41	18.17(12.68)	7.24(6.52)	38.36(6.33)	23.92(13.94)	10.05(8.38)	42.95(5.80)
Private Coll.	6	21.00(9.59)	8.66(6.62)	38.16(5.74)	32.16(12.43)	12.83(9.19)	44.00(7.42)
Public Coll.	14	16.71(10.42)	5.85(3.84)	38.50(5.59)	23.35(12.85)	7.85(4.89)	40.95(7.87)

accomplishment than human service professionals.

A series of exploratory one way ANOVA's were conducted on

TABLE 3
COMPARISON OF SUBSCALES MEANS BY GENDER: PRESENT
STUDY VERSUS CACCESE AND MAYERBERGER (1984)

Subscale	Male		Female	
	Present		Present	
	Study	C & M	Study	C & M
Frequency Dimension				
Emotional Exhaustion	1.81	1.50	2.44	2.19
Depersonalization	1.46	1.35	1.01	1.39
Personal Accomplishment	4.56	2.33	4.58	2.74
Intensity Dimension				
Emotional Exhaustion	2.54	2.46	2.76	3.44
Depersonalization	2.09	2.07	1.50	2.05
Personal Accomplishment	5.17	2.46	4.08	2.18

Note: The scores on Personal Accomplishment indicates less
burnout.

the demographic variables and the six subscales of the perceived burnout inventory. ($p > .01$). Results revealed a significant difference between gender with male coaches scoring significantly higher in both the frequency and intensity dimension of the depersonalization subscale, $F(1,300) = 7.17$, $p < .01$. Results also indicated a significant effect for marital status with married coaches scoring significantly higher (meaning less burned out) on the personal accomplishment subscale frequency dimension than the single or divorced coaches, $F(2,296) = 6.28$, $p < .01$. (see Table 4 for M's & SD's). Furthermore, results from the analysis of the type of sport and perceived burnout yielded a significant finding on the emotional exhaustion subscale in the frequency dimension, $F(11, 296) = 6.69$, $p < .01$. (see Table 5 for M's & SD's). Specifically, Newman Keuls post hoc test indicated that individuals coaching football, baseball and track & field scored significantly lower than individuals coaching swimming.

To further examine the relationship between the demographic variables and burnout, Persons Product Moment correlations were employed. In general, most of the relationships were low and nonsignificant. The variable that was found to be significantly related to burnout ($p < .05$) was how successful coaches rated themselves. Specifically, it was found that the more

TABLE 4

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF BURNOUT SUBSCALES AND LEADERSHIP STYLE

<u>Sex</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Frequency</u>			<u>Intensity</u>		
		Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization	Personal Accomplishment	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonalization	Personal Accomplishment
Male	232	16.34(10.86)	7.30(7.20)	36.54(6.92)	22.91(13.14)	10.94(8.60)	41.40(6.86)
Female	69	19.28(10.99)	5.02(4.49)	36.66(7.00)	24.91(13.05)	7.46(6.93)	40.68(7.40)
<u>Marital Status</u>							
Single	70	18.55(11.37)	6.44(5.35)	34.88(6.76)	25.51(13.93)	9.41(7.50)	39.72(8.39)
Married	204	16.38(10.38)	6.91(7.29)	37.50(6.34)	22.75(13.36)	9.86(8.76)	41.95(6.37)
Widowed	2	13.00(4.24)	4.00(0.00)	39.50(3.53)	14.50(3.53)	5.00(1.41)	43.00(1.41)
Divorced	23	17.95(10.93)	6.82(6.21)	33.65(9.77)	23.04(10.84)	10.78(8.66)	39.60(6.74)
<u>Education</u>							
Some College	1	9.00(0.00)	5.00(0.00)	48.00(0.00)	9.00(0.00)	2.00(0.00)	56.00(0.00)
College	67	14.95(9.41)	6.64(5.63)	35.54(6.21)	20.34(13.11)	9.31(7.18)	40.64(6.20)
Some postgrad.	92	17.62(10.87)	7.48(8.77)	38.09(5.78)	24.61(13.04)	10.67(9.49)	42.11(6.18)
Postgrad	132	17.70(11.54)	6.37(5.72)	35.25(8.62)	23.95(13.35)	9.42(8.12)	40.75(7.55)
Other	8	25.00(6.88)	6.25(1.70)	35.25(8.62)	34.50(10.87)	1.25(5.91)	44.00(4.24)
<u>School</u>							
Private H.S.	31	15.42(9.87)	5.90(4.95)	35.22(6.37)	24.51(13.70)	10.22(9.34)	41.51(7.15)
Public H.S.	177	17.72(11.25)	6.37(5.88)	36.94(6.80)	22.88(12.63)	9.31(7.27)	41.41(6.51)
Private Coll.	25	18.56(10.47)	7.08(5.08)	35.44(6.93)	27.56(14.46)	10.60(8.06)	40.44(6.98)
Public Coll.	67	14.67(9.25)	6.22(4.99)	36.58(7.59)	22.19(12.85)	9.65(7.12)	41.89(8.15)

TABLE 5

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF BURNOUT SUBSCALES FOR SPORTS

<u>Sport</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Frequency</u>				<u>Intensity</u>			
		Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonal- ization	Personal Accomplishment	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonal- ization	Personal Accomplishment	Emotional Exhaustion	Depersonal- ization
Swimming	22	23.77(12.05)	6.18(5.31)	36.59(6.66)	26.68(12.01)	9.59(8.80)	41.50(5.92)	26.68(12.01)	9.59(8.80)
Diving	2	22.50(10.60)	13.50(3.53)	41.00(4.24)	31.00(7.07)	21.50(4.94)	46.50(2.12)	31.00(7.07)	21.50(4.94)
Tennis	27	17.15(12.22)	7.03(6.23)	35.85(6.10)	27.55(13.94)	10.77(7.65)	41.14(2.12)	27.55(13.94)	10.77(7.65)
Track & Field	30	14.12(9.67)	6.96(9.20)	39.76(8.76)	21.53(18.65)	9.70(7.15)	42.46(8.93)	21.53(18.65)	9.70(7.15)
Golf	22	15.10(19.67)	5.81(5.66)	33.63(8.08)	19.36(13.94)	8.50(6.30)	38.04(8.23)	19.36(13.94)	8.50(6.30)
Soccer	22	20.68(10.02)	9.04(6.58)	35.04(8.06)	25.13(8.55)	9.27(6.15)	38.31(8.49)	25.13(8.55)	9.27(6.15)
Gymnastics	7	16.30(11.91)	3.71(5.62)	35.14(7.79)	23.14(15.34)	5.85(9.66)	40.42(10.99)	23.14(15.34)	5.85(9.66)
Football	61	14.19(9.20)	5.52(5.22)	38.11(5.98)	18.59(11.33)	8.00(6.53)	42.37(5.91)	18.59(11.33)	8.00(6.53)
Basketball	52	18.79(11.65)	8.53(10.50)	35.80(8.02)	25.61(14.70)	11.71(11.36)	40.53(7.55)	25.61(14.70)	11.71(11.36)
Baseball	25	13.28(7.64)	7.76(6.63)	37.40(6.42)	20.96(11.82)	10.96(7.36)	41.96(6.02)	20.96(11.82)	10.96(7.36)
Volleyball	24	16.87(12.23)	5.12(4.40)	35.45(6.94)	27.50(14.65)	8.12(6.58)	41.66(6.02)	27.50(14.65)	8.12(6.58)
Other	3	28.20(10.23)	10.40(7.92)	38.40(4.15)	41.80(9.09)	18.60(17.62)	41.80(2.95)	41.80(9.09)	18.60(17.62)

successful coaches rated themselves the lower the feelings of burnout on the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization subscales for both the frequency and intensity with correlations ranging from .20 to .25.

Crowne - Marlowe (1964) Social Desirability Scale (SDS) was also correlated with the MBI subscales to see if the coaches responses may have been influenced to be more socially desirable, but the MBI and the SDS scores were not significantly correlated.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Capel, S. A. (1986). Psychological and Organizational Factors related to Burnout in Athletic Trainers. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 57,321-328.
- Caccese, T. M., & Mayerberger, C. K. (1984). Gender Differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6,279-288.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24,349-354.
- Haggerty, T. (1982). An assessment of the degree of burnout in Canadian University coaches: A national survey. Master's Thesis, York University.
- Wilson, V. E., Haggerty, T., & Bird, E. I. (1986, September). Burnout in Coaching. Sports, The Coaching Association of Canada.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Leadership Behavior

The results indicated that there was a significant difference between leadership behavior and perceived burnout. Specifically, coaches with the consideration leadership style scored significantly higher on the frequency and intensity dimension of the emotional exhaustion subscale and the frequency and intensity dimension of the depersonalization subscale. Consideration as defined in the leadership research lists such characteristic behavior indicative of "friendship, mutual trust, respect, a certain warmth between supervisor and his men, and consideration of their feelings " (Harris & Fleishman, 1958, p. 465). Consideration has also been referred to as "reflecting the human relations aspect of group leadership " (Harris & Fleishman, 1958, p.465). Burnout research concludes that individuals in the human relation or helping professions are prime candidates for experiencing burnout. Individuals in these types of professions deal with people directly, give of themselves to others, are helpful, enthusiastic, idealistic and perhaps

overachievers. Their jobs may not always be pleasant dealing with life and death situations, emotional individuals and pressured for time , it is a stressful situation.

Shank (1983) identified different behavior characteristics that are likely to be present in individuals who may be prone to burnout. For example,"perfectionists set high sometimes unrealistic standards for themselves and are generally overachievers who invest more time and effort than necessary "(Shank, 1983, p. 54). Perfectionism is also typically something that is involved or needed in the human service professions. Becoming over involved with a client, patient or athlete is extremely easy for this type of individual. Another characteristic of an individual who is prone to burnout are those who are "other oriented", give more to others than themselves and feel that they must give help to rescue others (Shank, 1983).

Characteristics such as friendship, mutual trust, respect, warmth and investment of time and effort are qualities that would seem to be found in individuals not only in the human service or helping professions but also individuals who possess the consideration style of leadership behavior. It appears that individuals who choose the human service professions as their career have a variety of personality traits in common with individuals who

are consideration and other oriented, thus making them more susceptible to burnout.

Initiating structure as defined in the leadership literature is a supervisor who is authoritative and "plays a more active role in directing group activities through planning, scheduling and criticizing" (Harris & Fleishman, 1958, p. 465) to facilitate goal attainment. These elements of an individual's personality may help them deal with stressful and emotional situations without "getting involved". Even certain personality factors that seem characteristic of initiating structure style of leadership such as "going by the book" may just be a way of distancing oneself from individuals.

Leadership behavior and burnout has not been addressed by any other investigations making it difficult to refute or rebut any other findings. The crucial importance of this study is that it is the first study of its kind to strongly demonstrate a specific trait or characteristic of a coach as a contributing factor to perceived burnout. The results have established that leadership behavior has a significant relationship with the level of burnout. Changing the type or style of leadership behavior could be the best solution. But it would be difficult to change an individual's

personality makeup and researchers have not determined that one type of leadership behavior is "better" than the other in terms of production, satisfaction or performance.

A more logical approach would be to become more aware of certain characteristics that make a coach with the leadership style of consideration more susceptible to burnout. Coping skills such as stress management, improved physical fitness, conquered negative feelings towards coaching and location of a source of positive reinforcement would be beneficial (Wilson, Haggerty & Bird, 1986).

Demographic Variables

Gender: Results indicated that male coaches were significantly higher than female coaches on both the frequency and intensity dimensions of the depersonalization subscale. However, other studies have produced equivocal findings on this issue. For example, Wilson, Haggerty and Bird (1986) found no significant differences but Haggerty (1982) found that male coaches scored higher on the personal accomplishment subscale indicating that they were less burned out than female coaches. Caccese and Mayerberger (1984) found that female coaches scored signifi-

cantly higher on the emotional exhaustion subscale than the male coaches. The present investigation reported similar feelings of emotional exhaustion but the results were small and non-significant.

These equivocal findings concerning male-female differences may be explained in a couple of ways. First, throughout the four studies that have been documented, the particular type or level of coach in the sample has not been consistent. For instance, some studies used all college coaches while others included National team coaches and others used high school coaches.

A second reason for differing results may be situational variables or circumstances such as the time of the season that the questionnaires were completed. Questionnaires that were completed at the beginning of the season, in the middle of the season and at the end of the season may differ. Another explanation for the diverse findings may be due to the type of sport. The present study investigated twelve different types of sports (individual and team) whereas the other studies included a variety of other sports such as field hockey, rugby, ice hockey, lacrosse and water polo.

A potential problem area is that it is extremely difficult to

sample a truly "burned out coach" because if burnout has occurred, the individual would have left the coaching profession entirely. For example, Billy Maxwell, the track & field coach at LSU, recently resigned his position. He was quoted as saying, "This was not an easy decision, but due to burnout, this was the best decision to make for me " (Porretto, 1987, p. 11). This coach would be a perfect candidate to sample. However, it must be reiterated that "burnout is a cumulative, long term result of stress overtime " (Caccese & Mayerberger, 1984, p. 287).

Martial Status: One item of interest was found in the category of martial status. Specifically, married coaches had a significantly higher feeling of personal accomplishment than those who were single or divorced. Since there were so few (N=2) widowed subjects they were not included in this calculation. Previous research has not found any significant differences in martial status. (Caccese & Mayerberger, 1984; Haggerty, 1982 & Wilson, Haggerty & Bird, 1986). However, a possible explanation for these findings as mentioned in the gender section are the sample variations. The present study included 70% Texas high school coaches whereas Wilson, Haggerty and Bird (1986) had 100% National Level coaches, it seems logical that their feelings of personal accomplishment may

differ. Further research should focus on how different levels of coaches and athletes are affected by burnout.

Conclusions

- 1) There is no significant relationship between burnout and age, sport coached, education, rank or type of school.
- 2) Male coaches have a higher feeling of depersonalization than female coaches.
- 3) A significant relationship exists between leadership behavior and burnout. Coaches who have a consideration type of leadership behavior have significantly higher feelings of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization than do coaches with initiating structure type of leadership behavior.
- 4) Coaches who have a consideration type of leadership behavior exhibit significantly higher levels of burnout than the norms.

Recommendations

- 1) Additional testing in this area, with a larger sample, might provide information that indicates a consistent relationship between leadership behavior and burnout.

- 2) A sample of coaches who have left the profession due to burnout would provide a better representation of truly burned out coaches.
- 3) A sport specific measurement tool for both the athlete and coach needs to be developed.
- 4) Methods for eliminating feelings of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and low personal accomplishment should be tested and programs to orient administrators and supervisors to stress management and coping skills need to be developed.
- 5) Further studies should investigate win/loss percentage as a potential predictor of burnout since the low response rate to this question in the present investigation made it impossible to make any valid conclusions.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Caccese, T., & Mayerberger, C. (1984). Gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 279-288.
- Haggerty, T. (1982). An assessment of the degree of burnout in Canadian University coaches: A national survey. Masters Thesis, York Univeristy.
- Harris, E. F., & Fleishman, E. A. (1958). Human Relations Training and the Stability of leadership patterns. In C. G. Broune & T. S. Cohn (Eds.) The Study of Leadership. Danville, IL: The Interstate.
- Maslach, C. (1978). Burn-out: How to cope. Public Welfare, 36, 56-58.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1979, May). Burned- Out cops & their Families. Psychology Today, pp. 59-62
- Porretto, J. (1987). Maxwell resigns as head track coach. The Daily Reveille. Jan. 30, pp.11.
- Shank, P. A. (1983). Anatomy of burnout. Parks & Recreation, 17, 52-58.
- Wilson, V. E., Haggerty, T., & Bird, E. I. (1986, September). Burn-out in Coaching. Sports, The Coaching Assoication of Canada

APPENDIX A
LETTER TO HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

P.O. Box 13887
DENTON, TEXAS 76203-3887

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND DANCE

November 10, 1986

Judy Dale
6638 Aintree Circle
Dallas, TX 75214

Dear Sir:

I am a graduate student at North Texas State University completing my coursework, for my masters, with my thesis. The thesis is concerned with studying job related stress that creates burnout. The research thus far has covered a variety of occupations concerning burnout including teachers. I have chosen to study not just teachers but teachers who are coaches also. Burnout is a response to stress and we would like to see to what degree teacher-coaches experience burnout. With this information, we may begin to structure the environment to reduce or control the factors related to burnout.

The study consists of four questionnaires: Human Service Survey, Coaching Questionnaire, Crowne Marlowe Questionnaire and a demographic data sheet. We are gathering information from the head coaches of each sport. If a coach for example coaches two sports they should only fill out one set of questionnaires.

I greatly appreciate your much needed help and time. I have included 10 sets of questionnaires for all of your head coaches. I have enclosed a return card for you to fill out if you would like me to send you the results of the study.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me (214/696-0268).

Sincerely,

Judy Dale

Robert S. Weinberg, PhD.
Associate Professor & Research Director
North Texas State University

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO COLLEGE ATHLETIC DIRECTOR

NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY
P.O. Box 13857
DENTON, TEXAS 76203-3857

PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND DANCE

November 10, 1986

Judy Dale
6638 Aintree Circle
Dallas, TX 75214

I am a graduate student at North Texas State University completing my coursework, for my masters, with my thesis. The thesis is concerned with studying job related stress that creates burnout. The research thus far has covered a variety of areas concerning burnout but there has only been one study conducted on coaches and burnout. It is my intention to further delve into this area and gather additional information. Burnout is a response to stress, and we would like to determine if there are any specific variables that contribute to coaches experiencing burnout. With this information, we may begin to structure the environment to reduce or control the factors related to burnout.

The study consists of four questionnaires: Human Service Survey, Coaching Questionnaire, Crowne Marlowe Questionnaire and a demographic data sheet. We are gathering information from only the head coach in each sport.

I greatly appreciate your much needed help and time. I have included 10 questionnaires for all your head coaches. Since the results of this study could have an impact on the welfare of your coaches, I have enclosed a return card for you to fill in if you would like me to send you the results of the study.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me (214/696-0268).

Sincerely,

Judy Dale

Robert S. Weinberg, PhD.
Associate Professor & Research Director
North Texas State University

APPENDIX C
MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

Human Services Survey

This questionnaire is widely used in a variety of occupations, it uses the term "Recipients" to refer to the athletes that you instruct. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, write a "0" (zero) in both "HOW OFTEN" and "HOW STRONG" columns before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. Then decide how strong the feeling is when you experience it by writing the number (from 1 to 7) that best describes how strongly you feel.

HOW OFTEN:	0 Never	1 A few times a year or less	2 Once a month or less	3 A few times a month	4 Once a week	5 A few times a week	6 Every day	
HOW STRONG:	0 Never	1 Very mild, barely noticeable	2	3	4 Moderate	5	6	7 Major, very strong
HOW OFTEN:								

HOW OFTEN 0-6	HOW STRONG 0-7	Statements:
1. _____	_____	I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. _____	_____	I feel used up at the end of the workday.
3. _____	_____	I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.
4. _____	_____	I can easily understand how my recipients feel about things.
5. _____	_____	I feel I treat some recipients as if they were impersonal objects.
6. _____	_____	Working with people all day is really a strain for me.
7. _____	_____	I deal very effectively with the problems of my recipients.
8. _____	_____	I feel burned out from my work.
9. _____	_____	I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.
10. _____	_____	I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.
11. _____	_____	I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.
12. _____	_____	I feel very energetic.
13. _____	_____	I feel frustrated by my job.
14. _____	_____	I feel I'm working too hard on my job.
15. _____	_____	I don't really care what happens to some recipients.
16. _____	_____	Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.
17. _____	_____	I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my recipients.
18. _____	_____	I feel exhilarated after working closely with my recipients.
19. _____	_____	I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
20. _____	_____	I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.
21. _____	_____	In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.
22. _____	_____	I feel recipients blame me for some of their problems.

Reproduction by special permission of the Publisher, Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., Palo Alto, CA 94306, from The Human Service Survey by Christine Maslach & Susan Jackson, 1981. Further reproduction is prohibited without Publisher's consent.

APPENDIX D
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

COACHING QUESTIONNAIRE

Read each statement carefully and check the column which you feel most applies to the way you interact with your athletes (never, seldom, occasionally, often or always). These statements apply to what you usually do, not what you think you should do.

A = Always O = Often Occ = Occasionally S = Seldom N = Never

	A	O	Occ	S	N
1. I try out new ideas with team members.					
2. I ask that team members follow standard rules and regulations.					
3. I am friendly and approachable.					
4. I see to it that the work of team members is coordinated.					
5. I am easy to understand.					
6. I put suggestions made by team members into operation.					
7. I criticize poor work.					
8. I do personal favors for team members.					
9. I work without a plan.					
10. I emphasize the meeting of deadlines.					
11. I look out for the personal welfare of team members.					
12. I make my attitudes clear to team members.					
13. I do little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the team.					
14. I rule with an iron hand.					
15. I get team members approval on important matters before going ahead.					
16. I make team members feel at ease when talking with me.					
17. I encourage the use of uniform procedures.					
18. I let team members know what is expected of them.					
19. I am willing to make changes.					
20. I treat all team members as my equal.					
21. I see to it that team members are working up to capacity.					
22. I am slow to accept new ideas.					
23. I speak in a manner not to be questioned.					
24. I refuse to explain my actions.					
25. I act without consulting team members.					
26. I assign team members to particular tasks.					
27. I keep to myself.					
28. I find time to listen to team members.					
29. I maintain definite standard of performance.					
30. I make sure that my part in the team is understood by all team members.					

I coach a male female team.
(please check one or both.)

APPENDIX E
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

92

Read each statement carefully & check the appropriate answers that apply.

Your sex:

- ____ (1) male
____ (2) female

Your age:

____ years

Marital Status:

- ____ (1) single ____ (2) married
____ (3) divorced ____ (4) widowed
____ (5) other (please specify _____)

What was the highest year you completed in school (Check only one.)

- ____ (1) high school graduate
____ (2) some college
____ (3) college graduate
____ (4) some postgraduate work
____ (5) graduate degree ____ MS ____ PhD
____ (6) other (please specify _____)

What is the primary sport in which you coach? (Check only one)

- ____ (1) Swimming ____ (7) Gymnastics
____ (2) Diving ____ (8) Football
____ (3) Tennis ____ (9) Basketball
____ (4) Track & Field ____ (10) Baseball
____ (5) Golf ____ (11) Volleyball
____ (6) Soccer ____ (12) Other (please specify _____)

What is the level of achievement of your team? (list ranking)

- ____ (1) National ranking
____ (2) State ranking
____ (3) Regional ranking
____ (4) City ranking
____ (5) Unranked
____ (6) Other (please specify _____)

How many hours per week do you work in your sport?

- ____ (1) > 70 hours per week ____ (5) 30 - 39
____ (2) 60 - 69 ____ (6) 20 - 29
____ (3) 50 - 59 ____ (7) < 20 (____ hours per week)
____ (4) 40 - 49

How long have you been at your present position?
_____ years

93

How long have you been employed in coaching in general?
_____ years

What type of school do you coach in?

- _____ (1) private high school (4) state university
_____ (2) public high school (5) other (please specify _____)
_____ (3) private university

What is the percentage of wins that your team had in its last season.
_____ %

What is your win loss record as a coach.
_____ W _____ L

On a scale how successful would you rate yourself as a coach.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Unsuccessful				Moderately Successful						Extremely Successful

On a scale how successful are you in dealing with your athletes.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Unsuccessful				Moderately Successful						Extremely Successful

On a scale how much pressure do you put on yourself to win.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Very little				Moderate amount						A great deal

On a scale how much pressure do you feel from outside sources (parents, administrators, district, etc.)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Very little				Moderate						A great deal

APPENDIX F
CROWNE - MARLOWE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE

THE CROWNE-MARLOWE PERSONAL REACTION INVENTORY

Please read each statement carefully and check true or false as the sentence applies to you. Please use your first reaction.

<u>TRUE</u>	<u>FALSE</u>	
_____	_____	1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
_____	_____	2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
_____	_____	3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
_____	_____	4. I have never intensely disliked someone.
_____	_____	5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
_____	_____	6. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.
_____	_____	7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.
_____	_____	8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
_____	_____	9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen I would probably do it.
_____	_____	10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
_____	_____	11. I like to gossip at times.
_____	_____	12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
_____	_____	13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
_____	_____	14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
_____	_____	15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
_____	_____	16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
_____	_____	17. I always try to practice what I preach.
_____	_____	18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud mouthed, obnoxious people.
_____	_____	19. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
_____	_____	20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
_____	_____	21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
_____	_____	22. At times I have really insisted on having things my own way.
_____	_____	23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
_____	_____	24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong-doings.
_____	_____	25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
_____	_____	26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
_____	_____	27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
_____	_____	28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
_____	_____	29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
_____	_____	30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
_____	_____	31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
_____	_____	32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
_____	_____	33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

APPENDIX G
SUBSCALE MEANS BY GENDER: NORM GROUP
OF THE MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY

**SUBSCALE MEANS BY GENDER: NORM GROUP
OF THE MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY**

Subscale	Male	Female
Frequency Dimension		
Emotional Exhaustion	2.56	2.72
Depersonalization	2.09	1.79
Personal Accomplishment	1.54	1.48
Intensity Dimension		
Emotional Exhaustion	3.22	3.70
Depersonalization	2.54	2.22
Personal Accomplishment	2.06	2.02

Note: Norm group includes social security administrators, public contact employees, police officers, nurses, agency administrators, teachers, counselors, social workers, probation officers, mental health workers, physicians, psychologists, psychiatrists, attorneys, and others. Frequency dimension N=1,384(429 males;955 females); Intensity dimension N=1,928 (724 males;1,186 females).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bass, B. M. (1981). Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership -- A survey of theory and research. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Berkeley Planning Associates, (1977). Evaluation of child abuse and neglect demonstration projects, 1974-1977. IX Project management and worker burnout. US Department of Commerce (NTIS No. PB-278 446) Springfield, VA. National Technical Information Service (NCHSR 78-22).
- Bloch, A. (1976). The battered teacher. Today's Education, 66, 58-62.
- Capel, S. A. (1986). Psychological and Organizational Factors related to Burnout in Athletic Trainers. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 57, 321-328.
- Caccese, T. M., & Mayerberger, C. K. (1984). Gender differences in perceived burnout of college coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 279-288.
- Carroll, J. F. X., & White, W. L. (1982), Theory Building Integrating Individual and Environmental Factors within an Ecological Framework. In W.S. Paine (Ed.) Job Stress and Burnout. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers, 41-60.

- Chelladuria, P. (1978). A multidimensional model of leadership. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario.
- Chelladuria, P. (1984). Discrepancy between preferences and preceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 27-41.
- Chelladuria, P., & Carron, A. V. (1982). Task characteristics and individual differences, and their relationship to preferred leadership. Paper presented to NASPSPA Conference, College Park, MD.
- Chelladuria, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sport. Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 3, 85-97.
- Cherniss, C. (1980). Staff Burnout: Job Stress in the Human Services. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Cherniss, C. (1981). Trends to watch: Historical, political, social and economic. In W.S. Paine (Ed.) Proceedings of the First National Conference of Burnout. Philadelphia, PA.
- Cowley, W. H. (1928). Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders. Journal of Applied and Social Psychology, 23, 144-157.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1946). Response sets and test validity Educational Psychological Measurement, 6, 475-494.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1950). Further evidence on response sets and

- test design. Educational Psychological Measurement, 10, 3-31.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of Social Desirability independent of Psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.
- Danielson, R. P., Zelhart, P. F., & Drake, C.J. (1975). Multidimensional scaling and factor analysis of coaching behavior as perceived by high school hockey players. Research Quarterly, 46, 323-334.
- Edwards, A. L. (1957). The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Dryden.
- Erle, F. J. (1981). Leadership in competitive and recreational sport. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.
- Farber, B. A. (1982). Introduction: A critical Perspective on Burnout. Stress and burnout in the human service professions. NY: Pergamon Press.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff Burnout. Journal of Social Issues, 30, 150-165.
- Freudenberger, H. J. with Richelson, G. (1980). Burnout: The high cost of high achievement. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

- Fry, J., Kerr, S., & Lee, M. (1983). An Extension and test of path goal leadership theory, using athletic teams as a research sample. Paper presented at Academy of Management annual meeting, Dallas, TX.
- Gann, M. L. (1979). The role of personality factors and job characteristics in burnout: A study of social service workers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Gieck, J., Brown, R. S., & Shank, R. H. (1982, August). The Burnout Syndrome Among Athletic Trainers. Athletic Training, pp. 36-41.
- Haggerty, T. (1982). An assessment of the degree of burnout of Canadian University coaches: A national survey. Masters Thesis, York Univeristy.
- Halpin, A. W. (1955). The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders. Havard Educational Review, 25, 18-22.
- Halpin, A. W. (1957). The leader behavior and effectiveness of aircraft commanders. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leadership Behavior: its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research.
- Haplin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1966) The organizational climate of

- schools. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.) Theory and research in administration. NY: Macmillan.
- Halpin, A. W., & Winer, B. J. (1957). A factorial study of the Leader Behavior Descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leaders Behavior: its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Harris, E. F., & Fleishman, E. A. (1958). Human Relations Training and the Stability of leadership patterns. In C. G. Browne & T. S. Cohn (Eds.) The Study of Leadership. Danville, IL: The Interstate.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950a). Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of "superior" leaders. Journal of Social Psychology, 32, 11-22.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1950b). Leader behavior description. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1954). A Proposed theory of leadership in small groups. Columbus, Ohio; Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board, Technical Report, (unpublished) in R. M. Stogdill (1977). Leadership abstracts and Bibliography 1904-1974. College of Administrative Science at the Ohio State University.
- Hemphill, J. K., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of leader

- behavior description questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leader Behavior: its descriptions and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Business Research.
- Hemphill, J. K., Seigel, A., & Westie, C. W. (1974). An exploratory study of relations between perceptions of leader behavior, group characteristics and expectations concerning the behavior of ideal leaders. Columbus, Ohio: Personnel Research Board, Unpublished report. In R. M. Stogdill (Ed.) Handbook of Leadership -- a survey of theory and research. NY: The Free Press.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969, May) Lifecycle theory of leadership. Training & Development Journal, pp. 26-34.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). Management of organizational behavior. (3rd edition) Prentice-Hall.
- Homans, G. C. (1950). The Human Group. NY: Harcourt, Brace.
- House, R. J. (1971). Path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-338.
- Jones, J. W. (1980). The Staff Burnout Scale for Health Professionals. Park Ridge, IL: London House Press.
- Katzell, R. A., Korman, A. K., & Levine, E. L. (1977). Research Report #1: Overview of the dynamics of worker job mobility. National Study of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Service (SRS), 72- 05401.

- Kehl, D.G. (1981). Burnout: The risk of reaching too high. Christianity Today, 26, 26-28.
- Landsmann, L. (1978, April). Is teaching hazardous to your health? Instructor, pp. 49-50.
- Likert, R. (1950). Forward in Productivity, Supervision and morale in an office situation. University of Michigan Studies Research Center.
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. Human Behavior, 5, 16-22.
- Maslach, C. (1978). Burn-out: How people cope. Public Welfare, 36, 56-58.
- Maslach, C. (1981). Burnout: A social psychological analysis. In J.W. Jones (Ed.) The Burnout Syndrome. Park Ridge, IL: London House Management Press.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1979, May). Burned-Out Cops & Their Families. Psychology Today, pp. 59-62.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2, 99-113.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1982). Burnout in health professions: A social psychological analysis. In G. Sanders & J. Suls (Eds.) Social Psychology of health & illness. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Mattingly, M.A. (1977) Symposium: Stress & Burnout in

- childcare. Childcare, 6, 85-89.
- McGregor, D. (1960). The Human Side of Enterprise. NY: McGraw - Hill.
- McPherson, G. H. (1972). Small Town Teacher. Cambridge, MA: Havard University Press.
- Meehl, P. E., & Hathaway, S. R. (1946). The K factor as a suppressorvariable in the MMPI. Journal of Applied Psychology, 30, 525-564.
- Paine, W. S. (1982). Job Stress & Burnout: Research, Theory, and Intervention Perspectives. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Partens, M. B. (1933). Leadership among Preschool Children. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 27, 430-440.
- Patrick, P. S. K. (1981). Health Care Workers Burnout, What it is, What to do about it. Chicago, IL: Inquiry Books.
- Pigors, P. J. W. (1935). Leadership or Domenation. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Pines, A. M. (1981, April). Burnout: A current problem in pediatrics. Current Problems in Pediatrics.
- Pines, A. M. (1982). Helper's motivation and the burnout syndrome. In T. A. Wills (Ed.) Basic Processes in helping relation-

ships NY: Academic Press.

Pines, A. M., & Aronson, E. (1980). From Burnout to Personal Growth. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Montreal, Canada.

Pines, A. M., Aronson, E. with Kafry, D. (1981). Burnout: From Tedium to personal growth. NY: The Free Press.

Porretto, J. (1987). Maxwell resigns as head track coach. The Daily Reveille. Jan. 30, pp.11.

Reed, S. (1979). Teacher Burnout: a growing hazard. New York Times. Feb. 6, pp. A2.

Robinson, T. T., & Carron, A. V. (1982). Personal & Situational Factors Associated with Dropping Out vs Maintaining Participation in Competitive Sport. Journal of Sport Psychology, 4, 364-378.

Sakharoo, M., & Farber, B. A. (1983). A critical study of Burnout in Teachers. In B. A. Farber (Ed.) Stress and Burnout in the Human Service Professions. NY: Pergamon, pp.65-81.

Saris, R. J. (1969). The development of a 13th subscale to the LBDQ-Form XII entitled 'Responsibility Deference. University of Idaho, Doctoral Dissertation.

Schriesheim, C. A., & Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric Properties of the Ohio State Leadership Scale. Psychological Bulletin, 81,

756-765.

Schriesheim, C. A., Kinicki, A. J., & Schriesheim, J. F. (1979). The effect of leniency on leader behavior descriptions.

Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 23,1-29.

Seeman, M. (1957). A comparison of general and specific leader behavior descriptions. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (Eds.) Leader behavior: its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.

Serrin, W. (1979) .NEA says teachers burnout causes thousands to leave jobs. New York Times. July 6, pp. A8.

Shank, P. A. (1983). Anatomy of burnout. Parks & Recreation, 17, 52-58.

Shaw, S. F., Bensky, J. M., & Dixon, B. (1981). Stress & Burnout a Primer for Special Education and Special Service Personnel. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Shinn, M. (1982). Methodological Issues Evaluation and Using Information. In W. S. Paine (Ed.) Job Stress & Burnout. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishers, 61-79.

Smith, R. E. (1986). Toward a Cognitive-Affective Model of Athletic Burnout. Journal of Sport Psychology, 1, 36-50.

Stogdill, R. M. (1950). Leadership, membership and organization. Psychological Bulletin, 47,1-14.

- Stogdill, R. M. (1959). Individual behavior & group achievement. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1963). Manual for the LBDQ-Form XII. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1969). Validity of leader behavior description. Personnel Psychology, 22, 153-158.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Coons, A. E. (1957). Leader behavior: its description & measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Stogdill, R. M., & Scott, E. L. (1953). Aspects of Leadership & Organization. Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.
- Talyor, J. A. (1953). The personality scale and manifest anxiety. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 48, 285-290.
- Talyor, M., Crook, R., & Dropkin, S. (1961). Assessing emerging leadership behavior in small discussion groups. Journal of Educational Psychology, 52, 12-18.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). The Social Psychology of Groups. NY: Wiley.
- Wilson, V. E., Haggerty, T., & Bird, E. I. (1986, September). Burn-out in Coaching. Sports. The Coaching Association of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Yukl, G. A. (1971). Toward a behavioral theory of leadership. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 6, 414-440.