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ABSTRACT

Professional Burnout in Child Protection Workers

Staff burnout is a significant problem for many social service agencies. The current research comprised three studies, which investigated the relationship between personal resources and the perceived external working environment for child protection workers, and then devised and evaluated an intervention to reduce burnout. An interactive model of personality characteristics and physical work environment variables was proposed. The first study examined the prevalence of burnout in a sample of 122 District Officers from the NSW Department of Community Services. Participants completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the Coping Resources Inventory and a modified form of the Work Environment Scale. Results indicated that the sample was highly Emotionally Exhausted, with moderate levels of Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment. A combination of personal resources and work environment factors were found to be significant predictors of burnout. The second study entailed devising and evaluating a burnout prevention workshop based on the seven predictive variables. Results indicated that there was no significant difference within or between the treatment ($n=14$) or control ($n=19$) groups either before or following the intervention. Study three qualitatively analysed a discussion of these results by a focus group ($n=8$) who had been participants in the intervention. Thematic analysis indicated that: i) following the validation of their feelings during the workshop, they believed that they had rated their levels of burnout more accurately and higher following the workshop than they had prior to the workshop, and ii) participants felt that the workshop had been instrumental in promoting positive change that was not detected by the statistical analyses. Further themes and recommendations to assist in burnout prevention for child protection workers were also identified.
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CHAPTER 1

The Nature of Burnout

"For many of the helping professionals that we interviewed, one of the major signs of burnout was the transformation of a person with creativity and commitment into a mechanical, petty bureaucrat who goes by the book."

(Maslach, 1978, p. 118)

1.1 Introduction

The phenomenon of staff burnout is a significant problem amongst many social service agencies (Maslach, 1977; Sowers-Hoag & Thyer, 1987). The staggering financial, personal and social costs associated with staff burnout indicate that if these agencies and their staff are to function effectively, then research must be undertaken by each agency to examine the relationship between their provision of working environment, the personality characteristics of those that they employ, and their levels of staff burnout.

The Department of Community Services is the state child protection agency in New South Wales, and is set up to investigate and act upon notifications of children who are potentially at risk of being abused. Currently, this agency employs approximately six hundred District Officers, whose job it is to take notifications from the community of children who may be at risk and to then investigate these allegations. The investigation usually entails interviewing the child at school, at home or in the Community Services Centre, and then interviewing the family of the child. Often the family has no prior knowledge of the Department, and thus, the District Officer's job must also entail
describing the machinations of the investigative process and the role of the Department in relation to child welfare.

The Department has calculated that it spends approximately $50,000 on initial training per District Officer. This sum incorporates a three month training course, departmental costs, and the Officer's salary during that time. Unfortunately however, during the last decade departmental statistics have revealed that the average length of employment for new officers is eleven months. This has led to much investigation as to why staff are leaving the department so soon after joining, yet the implementation of change has been limited.

Over the last few years this situation became increasingly pressing with the move towards Enterprise Agreement Bargaining. The Public Service Association has also shown interest in the number of District Officers who are currently on stress leave, and the increasing number of claims in this area has prompted the Government Insurance Office to question its policy on liability in relation to stress claims. The severity of this phenomenon has also been raised as a parliamentary issue. While this has been a political, rather than a psychological agenda, it is raising the level of awareness regarding the phenomenon of burnout within the department and is also demonstrating the debilitating effects that it is having on workers.

1.2 Child Protection

In comparison to many of the other human service providers, there has been a dearth of research into burnout in child protection workers. Fryer, Poland, Bross and Krugman (1988) state that child protection is probably the most
sensitive area of the human services, and McGee (1989) has stated that previous research has documented the high incidence of burnout in this profession. Fryer et al. (1988) summarise the difficulties faced by workers thus:

"They often labor without definitive procedural guidelines in a difficult and demanding environment. The public is outraged when injury/death occurs to children in their caseloads. But on the other hand, workers are accused of "Gestapo tactics" by parents whose children they remove from the home. These parents typically claim overreaction resulting in violation of their parental rights. Child protection workers are confronted daily with the task of working with unmotivated family members who resent their efforts" (p. 481).

Marks and Hixon (1986) note that the practice of child welfare involves intervention into families on individual, family, and social system levels and that as a result, caseworkers need to be able to conceptualise and work at many different levels. This leads to the worker assuming various roles, which may be conflicting and can range from advocate, to broker of services, case manager, therapist and investigator. They note that child protective service workers are often highly motivated, but inexperienced new graduates and that they experience more stress from their caseloads and from the community than do workers in many other service delivery areas.

Sandford, Dollard & Winefield (1997) surveyed child protection workers in a large public sector welfare agency in South Australia in relation to their work experiences, psychological distress, burnout and job satisfaction. They found that the most stressful aspects identified by the child protection workers included their clients' unpredictable behaviour, verbal abuse by clients and working with the consequences of family violence on children.
Fiske, Diamond & Flanagan (1992) noted the issues that they perceived child protection workers needed to understand in relation to their stress responses to protective work. These included acknowledging stress, recognising the sources of stress in the statutory environment, stresses in the worker/client relationship, stresses in the worker/supervisor and worker/management relationship and the risk of burnout associated with child sexual abuse work.

LeCroy and Rank (1986) found that child abuse workers had the highest mean on the emotional exhaustion index than any other human service professions that they surveyed. In their study of 106 social workers, they found that child abuse workers scored considerably higher on Emotional Exhaustion compared to Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment, but that their scores on these latter two factors were also higher than for other professions.

McGee (1989), studied the relationship between burnout and casework decision-making among 70 child protection service workers. It was found that burnout was only associated with impaired decision-making in especially chronic cases, and only among those workers who denied the need for caseworkers to be involved with the family.

Jayaratne, Chess and Kunkel (1986) studied 75 female child welfare workers and their husbands in relation to burnout and the effects of work stress on family relations. They found that stress at work affected all aspects of the individual’s life, and postulated that it was a vicious cycle, whereby stress at work exacerbates stress in the marriage, and marital conflict then affects job performance. They claim that workers tend to mask these symptoms of stress from their spouse, which then leads to a lack of support from the spouse. They believe that often the spouse is aware of job dissatisfaction for the worker, but not the level of strain on the worker. They propose that the way to break the
cycle would be to promote communication to the spouse about the effects of stress on the worker, in order for the spouse to be able to offer increased support and thereby decrease the strain on the marital relationship.

Given that the limited amount of research on the effects of professional burnout in relation to child protection work has described such profound personal and professional consequences, it is crucial that further research be conducted to explore these issues.

1.3 Burnout

Freudenberger in 1974, first coined the term "burnout" in a journal editorial, in relation to "free clinic" workers in America. It then became used as a colloquial term to describe an emotionally depleted state among those in the helping professions. Since that time, research has evolved to the point where burnout is now seen as a distinct phenomenon involving negative effects on the individual. Burnout is more extreme than, and disparate to, occupational stress, which does not always involve a negative effect and can often be seen as a motivating force for the individual (Starrin, Larsson & Styrborn, 1990; Leiter, 1991b).

Burnout is regarded as a phenomenon that develops over time, rather than being a result of an isolated incident. Hence, it is different from critical incident stress, where one incident produces a traumatised psychological response in the individual (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Kyriacou, 1987; Fimian, 1988). This chronic, everyday stress is seen as being a result of intense involvement with clients, where the individual staff member is required to ask probing questions about the most intimate details of their client's lives, often
involving consequent feelings of fear, anger, embarrassment and despair (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Maslach and Jackson (1981) note that the professional who continually works with people in these circumstances, with such a high level of chronic stress is at risk of burning out.

In recent years, researchers have described the evolution of burnout theory from a uni-dimensional to a multi-dimensional model (Buunk & Schaufeli, 1993; Maslach 1993; Maslach, 1998). Maslach (1998) notes that it is the inclusion of the other two factors of burnout, depersonalisation and personal accomplishment that make burnout a fuller description than merely an individual stress response of emotional exhaustion and gives it a broader definition than established ideas of occupational stress. She reports that the significance of the multi-dimensional model is that it clearly places the individual stress experience within a social context. She notes that it is the centrality of relationships at work, whether the relationships with clients, colleagues or supervisors that has always been at the heart of burnout and reflects the source of both emotional strains and rewards.

Kahn (1993) states that as professionals give of themselves in the course of their work with clients, they are ideally accessible emotionally, as well as physically and intellectually, in creating meaningful relationships with their clients. They thus risk being emotionally drained, giving of themselves, until they have nothing more to offer. Kirkcaldy, Thome and Thomas (1989) noted that the daily events which confront a worker, such as the failure of a rehabilitation programme, a suicide attempt, or the destructive behaviour of a child, can represent incidents which are difficult to recover from in the relatively short periods of relaxation and recreation after work.
Kilburg, Nathan and Thoreson (1986) described professionals as being their own worst enemies, as they are trained to be independent, creative, assertive, competitive and hard-driving, however do not readily acknowledge when they are in trouble or need assistance. They state that the combination of socialisation and personality characteristics leads the worker to struggle on with a problem long after many other people would have at least sought consultation from family members or friends. They note "solitary battles are the most destructive for anyone because of the ease with which one loses perspective" (p. 25).

Maslach, in 1978, described the burnout process as involving a loss of concern for clients, characterised by an emotional exhaustion in which the professional no longer has any positive feelings, sympathy, or respect for clients or patients. She states that these professionals then develop a very cynical and dehumanised perception of their clients, in which they are labelled in derogatory ways and treated accordingly. Maslach and Jackson (1981) note that as the professional's emotional resources are depleted, they are no longer able to give of themselves at a psychological level. This sense of exhaustion and detachment can then lead to negative self-evaluation, as they perceive that they are under-achieving in their chosen profession and are dissatisfied with the outcome.

Goroff (1986), further defined burnout as a phenomenon which includes factors of disappointment, disillusionment, fatigue, hopelessness, and powerlessness, which a person experiences when confronted with contradictions between a desire to help others and the structural demands and limitations of the social services. Sowers-Hoag and Thyer (1987) described professionals who have burned out as being unable to deal successfully with the emotional stress associated with their job. This can be manifested in low worker morale,
impaired performance, absenteeism and high job turnover. McGee (1989) has noted that burnout has also been associated with impairment of the helping professional's ability to attend, concentrate and engage in complex thinking and problem solving.

Garden (1991) in a study of 95 mid-career MBA students, found that perceived low performance and self-esteem measures were most strongly linked with burnout scores, even when actual performance had not been significantly affected. Jackson, Schwab and Schuler (1986) found in their research that, while burnout can predict subsequent job turnover, many professionals who defined themselves as being burnt out remained in their jobs, despite their stated preference to leave the job, and in many cases their profession.

Maslach (1978), and Maslach and Jackson (1981), have linked burnout to an increase in psychosomatic symptoms and self-perception of mental illness. Researchers have noted that burnout can lead to a deterioration in the quality of service to clients and an increase in self-reported indices of personal distress, such as physical exhaustion, poor physical health, insomnia, increased use of alcohol and drugs, and marital and family problems (Maslach and Jackson, 1981; Kahill, 1988; McGee, 1989; Huebner, 1993). Maslach (1978) notes: "after an emotionally trying day with clients, the staff member may simply want to get away from all people for a while, but this desire for solitude usually comes at the expense of family and friends" (p. 113).

Maslach (1978, 1982, 1986) conceptualises burnout as a phenomenon that is experienced on a continuum and is comprised of three distinct factors: emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment, of which emotional exhaustion is the most significant. Jackson et al. (1986) see these components as being conceptually distinct,
although they are not assumed to be empirically uncorrelated. These will now be briefly discussed below.

1.3.1 Emotional Exhaustion

Emotional exhaustion is defined as "feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one's work" (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 2). It is experienced when the professional becomes over-involved emotionally, or over-extended. The individual feels overwhelmed by the emotional demands imposed by other people, resulting in feeling drained and used up, lacking enough energy to face another day. As Maslach states; "Their emotional resources are depleted and there is no source of replenishment" (1982, p. 3).

Jackson et al. (1986) note that the use of the word "exhaustion" implies the underlying assumption by researchers that the job is very involving, requiring prior states of high arousal, as compared to jobs where elements of boredom or tedium may be experienced. They state that this may be inherent in, although not limited to, human service professions.

Robinson, Roth, Keim, Levenson, Flentje and Bashor (1991) found in a study of 314 nurses, that emotional exhaustion was predicted by high work pressure, low involvement and low supervisor support in the individual's working environment. Oktay (1992) found that belonging to a support group, age and autonomy were the best predictors of both emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation.
1.3.2 Depersonalisation

Depersonalisation is described as "an unfeeling response towards recipients of one's service, care, treatment, or instruction" (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 2). Maslach (1982) states that when professionals are feeling emotionally exhausted, one method of reducing this feeling is to reduce their involvement with others to a minimum, in order to get the job done. As a result, workers tend to become petty bureaucrats who will be ruled by guidelines, and who "pigeon-hole" clients in order to respond to a category, rather than developing a unique response to an individual client. Jackson et al. (1986) note that this can be manifested in the labelling of people with object or category names, such as "the knee problem in Room 502", rather than referring to the individual. The professional avoids having to get to know the other person or become emotionally involved. Maslach (1982) states that this perception of others can often deteriorate to the extent that; "It is as though the individual is viewing other people through rust-coloured glasses - developing a poor opinion of them, expecting the worst from them, and even actively disliking them." (p. 4).

Miller, Ellis, Zook and Lyles (1990) found that when caregivers see themselves as treating their clients in a depersonalised manner, they feel less personal accomplishment, less satisfaction with their work, and more emotional exhaustion. Savicki and Cooley (1987) found that depersonalisation was linked to the source and type of direction that was placed on workers. They suggested that depersonalisation of clients increased when the administration treated workers in a rigid, bureaucratic fashion and management imposed many rules and pressures, particularly in a work context which implicitly required complex, creative decisions on a moment-to-moment basis. Lower depersonalisation scores were associated with an environment in which
workers were directed to plan efficiently for themselves in order to get the job done.

Robinson et al. (1991) found that depersonalisation was predicted by task orientation, work pressure, involvement and age. Leiter (1988) found that high burnout was related to diminished organisational commitment, which was also related to aspects of the interpersonal dynamics of the organisation, such as supervisor support and peer relations.

1.3.3 Personal Accomplishment

Personal accomplishment is defined as "feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people" (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 2) and is inversely related to the other two factors of burnout, although it should not be assumed to be their opposite. Maslach (1982) suggests that when an individual is experiencing burnout, they tend to have a reduced sense of personal accomplishment where their negative perception of others can progress until it encompasses feelings about themselves. Reduction in feelings of personal accomplishment for the worker may arise as a result of feeling distressed or guilty about the quality of their interactions with others and a fear that they are becoming the type of person that they and others do not like very much. This can lead to a sense of inadequacy, feelings of failure, and sometimes depression.

Bhagat and Allie (1989) have proposed that feelings of personal accomplishment and a sense of competence can moderate and act as a buffer against job stress. In their study of 276 teachers, they found that highly competent individuals reported greater satisfaction with work and with co-workers, greater satisfaction with supervision, and less feelings of emotional
exhaustion and depersonalisation under high life stress conditions than those who thought of themselves as being less competent. Jayaratne and Chess (1986) found in a survey of 62 married female child welfare workers, that perceptions of competence provided a buffer against job stress and job deficits. LeCroy and Rank (1986) in a survey of 106 social workers found that workers with a positive professional image had developed a sense of identity with their work and were content. Conversely, those who exhibited low professional self-esteem seemed to have over compensated for their negative feelings by over-involvement with their clients or by setting unrealistic goals about their job effectiveness.

Savicki and Cooley (1987) found that personal accomplishment was most clearly related to peer support. They suggested that co-workers may function as a reference group against which workers judge their competence, or as an ongoing supervision and consulting resource to celebrate accomplishments and to render advice and solutions for problems.

1.3.4 Demographic Factors Associated with Burnout

Demographic factors such as gender, age, experience and marital status have all been linked to burnout. Manlove (1993) found that those with more education, training and work experience reported higher levels of personal accomplishment. Hetherington, Oliver, and Phelps (1989) found that those who experience burnout are typically single people who have an achievement orientation. They are also described as having self-defeating behaviours such as an inability to say 'no', are resistant to self-examination, have a tendency to over-schedule time, a lack of attendance to personal needs, and make excessive attempts to please others. McMullen and Krantz (1988) noted that the helping professionals who were most likely to experience burnout were young, white,
unmarried females in the early stages of their work experience. Maslach and Jackson (1985) found that married employees, and those with children, regardless of sex, experienced less burnout than single people. Greenglass and Burke (1988) postulated that family life may enable people to deal more effectively with interpersonal situations and crisis situations, due to the extensive practical training in conflict resolution and problem solving that is typically associated with family life. In addition, family life can often provide social support and be a resource for discussing and experimenting with innovative ideas that can assist in coping with stress and stressful situations.

1.3.4(i) Age and Burnout

Age has been found to be significantly related to burnout, in that older people generally tend to report less burnout. The literature is unclear as to whether they have possibly already been burnt out and developed coping strategies as a result of this experience, or whether they progressively develop protective mechanisms throughout life which shield them from burnout.

Huberty and Huebner (1988), in a study of school psychologists, found that age was negatively associated with burnout scores, and suggested that as professionals become older, they may develop a variety of behavioural and attitudinal patterns that reduce the likelihood of burnout. Other researchers have also found that age is significantly related to burnout, in that younger people tend to score higher on the emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation scales, whereas older people tend to score higher on the personal accomplishment scale (Maslach & Jackson 1981; Robinson et al. 1991).

Rosenthal, Schmid, and Black (1989) found a relationship between higher age and greater problem solving ability. They suggested that professionals who
have lived longer and experienced more life situations have a greater tendency to rely on a planned and structured approach in dealing with occupational stress, rather than younger professionals who reported a greater amount of perceived job stress.

Maslach and Jackson (1981) concluded from their research that younger people in the first few years of their career were more likely to experience burnout than older people. They stated that this may simply mean that younger people left the profession, and suggested that their sample may have been the result of a select group of those that had managed to stay on and survive. Carr, Roseingrave and Fitzgerald (1996) found similar results in a study of 56 staff caring for cystic fibrosis patients. They noted that 20% of their sample obtained clinically significant scores on a general health measure. This group tended to be younger and reported more somatic and anxiety symptoms, had more social problems and reported being exposed to more life event stressors in the preceding 6 months. They also reported more daily stressors both within and outside the work environment. These results would seem to indicate that, rather than younger people actually having more daily stressors, they experience these stressors as being more stressful than older people. Conversely, older people may have developed alternate coping strategies over time, which they implement before defining a situation as stressful.

1.3.4(ii) Experience, Education and Burnout

Length of experience in the human service agency and amount of education have also been found to be significantly related to burnout, in that more highly qualified and experienced professionals are less likely to report feeling burnt out. Carney, Donovan, Yurdin, Starr, Pernell-Arnold and Bromberg (1993) conducted a study of 66 intensive case managers working with clients with a
mental illness. They found that the greater the professional’s experience in working with clients who had suffered a severe and persistent mental illness, the less they experienced emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. They cite Maslach and Jackson’s (1981) supposition that experienced practitioners will have developed effective coping mechanisms over time. However, they do not appear to have considered the argument that these practitioners may be the residual staff left, after others have already burnt out.

Other researchers have also found that professional staff with experience are less at risk than those who are trainees or new graduates (Fryer et al., 1988; Rodolfa, Kraft & Reilley, 1988; Himle & Jayaratne, 1990; Langemo, 1998). Level of education has also been found to significantly predict autonomy and control (Rodolfa et al. 1988; Scheid, Fayram & Littlefield, 1995). Rodolfa et al. (1988) found that, in a study of 279 counselling staff members in the United States, 61% of client behaviours and therapist experiences were significantly more stressful for trainees than for professional staff. They found that trainees would more often and more readily assume responsibility for “fixing the client”, and as a result would experience feelings and thoughts of incompetency and inadequacy when their treatment interventions did not succeed. Interestingly, “trainees” were defined as those who had completed an undergraduate degree, whereas “professionals” were defined as those who had completed a Masters degree or higher. This would seem to indicate a high level of academic achievement prior to definition of professional experience, and higher academic status than would be expected for a child protection worker in Australia.

Melchior, van den Berg, Halfens, Abu Saad and Huyer (1997) surveyed 361 unit leaders, psychiatric nurses, practical nurses and nurses aids in psychiatric long-care settings. They found that work environments associated with low
levels of burnout were those in which workers had good support and feedback, job clarity, autonomy and low levels of complexity in their work. These environments also had managers with a social leadership style of supervision, and workers reported having realistic expectations about their patient’s rehabilitation potential. Interestingly however, the researchers found that it was not the individual amount of work experience of the nurse that was important in determining burnout, but the mean level of experience of the nursing staff as a whole. This would seem to indicate that lack of experience in a supportive environment where trainees can call on the expertise of the more experienced staff does not predict a propensity to burnout. Rather, burnout is likely to be more prevalent where staff are generally inexperienced.

Cherniss (1980) and Leiter (1991b) have both suggested that the trainee or new graduate is significantly at risk of burnout due to their unrealistic expectations upon entering the workforce. They propose that upon entering the work setting, the new graduate is confronted with the realisation that they are faced with limitations upon their time, resources, and the guidelines of the work setting itself. They suggest that in order to alleviate some of this stress, and to minimise the disparity between idealism and reality, induction programmes should be offered simultaneously through the workplaces and the universities, similar to those trialled by Kramer (1974).

Sandell and Sullivan (1992) have suggested that there are developmental aspects to professional growth. They propose that there are three stages of professional development, and that the first of these is the stage of the “embryonic” professional, who has not experienced professional growth. They note that this is a stage that is not necessarily limited to those who are inexperienced. The next stage is “the consolidated learner”, and involves the professional who has developed base skills and who has a consolidated
knowledge of fundamental theories and issues involved in the workplace. Finally, they describe the "professionally maturing" worker; who is at the highest stage of what is seen as a continuous process of professional development. They suggest that the associations with burnout are different for each stage of development. They found that those who were less professionally developed cited the major cause of disillusionment as being "difficulties with clients" and "poor supervision", whereas the higher two groups cited "frustrations with relationships" and "lack of environmental stimulation" as major causes.

Hunt (1975) has likewise suggested a developmental model of professional growth, which he perceives as being based upon conceptual levels. He posits that more mature individuals are able to organise their own environments, whereas those who are less mature need the stabilising influence of a well structured setting. He believes that the professional who is at a higher conceptual level is more complex, more capable of responsible action, and better able to adapt to a changing environment than someone at a lower conceptual level. He states that professionals at a lower conceptual level are more dependent on external standards and less capable of generating their own concepts, and will profit from a more structured environment. Those at a higher conceptual level will profit from lower structure, or be less affected by variation in structure in their environments.

1.3.4(iii) Gender and Burnout

Gender has been one of the demographic factors that has been queried in the literature as to the extent and nature of its relationship with burnout. While both men and women are equally likely to experience burnout, it is thought that the process of burnout may differ between the sexes (Maslach, 1982). In
general, it is believed that women are more likely to experience greater emotional exhaustion than men when burning out, and men are likely to experience greater depersonalisation than women. However, this has tended to be a statistical trend in studies, rather than a consistent significant difference (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Himle, Jayaratne & Chess, 1986; LeCroy & Rank, 1986; Greenglass & Burke, 1988).

Greenglass and Burke (1988) have suggested that the aetiology of burnout is different for men than for women. In their study of 556 teachers, they found that men tended to experience burnout only in relation to job factors (doubts about competence, problems with clients and lack of fulfillment), whereas women experienced burnout in relation to both work and personal factors. They concluded that one of the aetiological factors of burnout for women was role conflict between negotiating work and family/home commitments. Leiter, Clark and Durup (1994) cite literature which suggests that correlates of burnout may differ between men and women, in that men tend to report greater physical ill-health, while women report greater psychological ill-health. Hetherington et al. (1989) suggest that women may experience greater emotional exhaustion than men. They describe women as having been socialised and encouraged to find worth in their involvement with others; with the implication of warmth, nurture, support and passivity and the habit of putting others' needs before their own.

Himle et al. (1986), in a study of 617 clinical social workers, found that the best predictor of emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation for both males and females was intent to resign. However, the reasons for the increase in these feelings differed across gender: males reported increased amounts of client contact and role ambiguity as causational, whereas women reported decreased supervisor and peer support and decreased job challenge. They noted that
decreased emotional support from supervisors and co-workers was predictive of irritation, emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation in women, but not for men.

This finding of an increase in burnout factors for women when emotional support decreases, supports the theory by Pines, Aronson and Kafry (1981) that women may seek to cope with work stress by talking about it more with co-workers and may share more of their feelings than men. In contrast, they believe that men are more likely to have depersonalised feelings about the people with whom they work. Greenglass and Burke (1988) build on this theory by suggesting that dissatisfaction with work relationships may be problematic for women in that they tend to utilise social support more effectively than men, talking to others as a way of coping with stress. They believe that this is congruent with traditional female role modelling and suggest that dissatisfaction with work relationships may leave women socially and emotionally isolated.

Leiter et al. (1994) have pointed out the inconsistencies in the literature in terms of gender differences in burnout, arguing that generally, findings have been weak and unreliable. This is exemplified by the findings of Hetherington et al. (1989), who noted that women in their study were more emotionally exhausted than men, but also had a greater experience of depersonalisation, which is contrary to the bulk of the research. Leiter et al. (1994) conclude by agreeing with Maslach and Jackson (1985) that these inconsistencies in findings on gender and burnout may well be a function of the different occupational roles of men and women. They suggest that men may choose more "male oriented" professions such as the Police Force or Fire Fighting Force, while women may choose to work in more "female oriented" positions, such as working with other women and children. These differences in roles may then make findings
about "human service professionals" difficult to qualify, as the samples are inherently skewed by gender.

Having examined the demographic factors associated with burnout, the following section will examine the theoretical perspectives on burnout.

1.4 Theoretical Perspectives of Burnout

There are two major perspectives on burnout in the literature. The first perspective has focussed on the dispositional characteristics of either the staff or the client population (Maslach, 1977). This assumes that there is something inherent in, and common to the staff in terms of personality characteristics that causes them to burn out. Manlove (1993) has stated that, although there may be environmental features common to burnout situations, not all individuals actually experience burnout. Hence, it must be queried as to which individual personality factors contribute to the experience of burnout.

Frequently, the dispositional qualities of the client population are also viewed as contributing to staff burnout, where the clients are seen to possess traits of being resistant, ungrateful, depressed etc. These two factors have led to preventive approaches and attempts to alleviate burnout either being focused on altering the internal state of the staff who are experiencing burnout, so as to change their personality characteristics, or focussing on how they feel about or respond to their client population.

The other perspective postulates that burnout is highly correlated with job stress and the work environment (Maslach, 1977; Cherniss, 1980; Leiter, 1991a; Savicki 1993; Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Maslach (1977) notes that; "all too often
people are blamed rather than their work environment" (p.14). She contends that the prevalence of the phenomenon and the range of diverse professionals who are affected by burnout, suggests that the search for causes is better directed away from the worker and towards uncovering the operational and structural characteristics of their job situations. She states; "We have reached the point at which the number of rotten apples in the barrel warrants examination of the barrel itself" (Maslach, 1977, p. 14).

The most recent literature however, proposes interactive models of burnout, which focus on the interplay between the person and the environment (Huebner, 1993; Schulz, Greenley & Brown, 1995; Brown & O'Brien, 1998). Huebner (1993) has suggested that burnout can originate from three potential sources:

a) organisational factors (eg, structure and climate, role issues, resources);
b) interpersonal factors (eg, quality of peer and supervisory interactions);
c) intrapersonal factors (eg, personality traits, competencies).

This is the type of model that will be used in the current study.

1.4.1 Work Environments and Burnout

The study and assessment of social environments are important because of their relevance to individual functioning. Insel and Moos (1974) suggest that the "climate" of environments in which people function relates to their satisfaction, self-esteem, mood and to their personal growth. Leiter (1988) also contends that while the study of demographic and personality variables in relation to burnout may be interesting, aspects of work settings are generally more amenable to change and have more motivation to be changed than either of the aforementioned characteristics. Otto (1983) has stated that too often
workers are blamed for problems that are inherently linked to work-related stress, and that this perpetuates a "victim-blaming" ideology. This serves to promote solutions to stress problems as if they were problems of individuals in isolation, and therefore deflects attention from organisational and structural sources of stress. It also ignores the fact that the coping responses that people use are affected by, and limited to, organisational and societal constraints.

Murray (1938), first introduced the concept of "environmental press". He suggested that individuals have strengths and weaknesses, which are the components of personality, and that environments are able to either meet the needs of these personalities or frustrate them. Insel and Moos (1974) suggest that a general principle has evolved, in that the way in which one perceives their surroundings influences the way in which one behaves in that environment. They note that environments have the power to shape potential, as well as to facilitate or inhibit creativity and coping behaviour.

Mumford (1968) saw ideal environments as "seeking continuity, variety, orderly and purposeful growth", as compared to an environment that "magnifies authoritarian power and minimizes or destroys human initiative, self-direction and self-government" (p. 221). Moos (1987a) states that:

"as expected, considerate supervisors who specify clear goals and encourage participation in decision making tend to promote good employee morale and personal accomplishment, as do well-organized work settings that have flexible policies. Cohesive and independence-oriented work settings that also are well organized and provide meaningful and challenging tasks tend to produce high work performance. Job ambiguity and group conflict are likely to create tension and alienation, as are situational constraints and highly structured tasks and leaders" (p. 235).
Moos (1987a) and others report on a considerable body of research that has examined the connections between specific work settings and employee morale and performance (Brown, 1986; Golembiewski & Roundtree, 1986; Moos, 1987a; Leiter, 1991b; Robinson et al. 1991; Oktay, 1992; Wilber & Specht, 1994). Moos states that there are four aspects of work climate that have been associated with mental and physical strain among employees:

i) high job demands;

ii) difficulties with supervisors;

iii) insufficient opportunity to participate in decision making;

iv) lack of clarity about the job and criteria for adequate performance.

In general, Moos believes that strain is most likely to occur when job demands are high and the individual has little discretion in deciding how to meet them. He suggests that when employees are allowed to make decisions about their work, high job demands can be perceived as stimulating and can promote active problem solving and innovation.

Savicki and Cooley (1987) have defined the characteristics of high and low burnout environments. They state that the work environments associated with low levels of burnout are those in which workers are strongly committed to their work, co-worker relationships are encouraged, and supervisory relationships are supportive. They define high burnout environments as those:

i) where there is a high demand for personal adherence to work, while worker freedom or flexibility is restricted;

ii) where planning and efficiency for the task at hand is not emphasised;

iii) where job expectations are vague or ambiguous;

iv) where management imposes extensive rules and regulations to constrain employees;

v) where support and encouragement of new ideas and procedures is low.
Leiter (1991b) has suggested that interventions that enhance work group autonomy and provide opportunities for professionals to utilise their skills while developing their competence would reduce burnout. Savicki (1993) in a study of 94 mental health workers from 10 different agencies, found that child and youth care workers functioned in a radically different work environment than did supervisors or outpatient therapists. He noted that while no one category of worker was more burned out than another, their differing burnout reactions were clearly related to the variation in their work environment. Maslach and Leiter (1997) support this research, stating that burnout is a sign of major dysfunction within an organisation and says more about the workplace than it does about the characteristics of the employees.

Whilst a great deal of research has examined the relationship between specific aspects of the work environment and levels of burnout, Cherniss (1980) was one of the first to suggest that burnout was a result of inconsistencies implicit in the role of a service professional. He stated that new professionals expect their work to consistently confirm their competence, assuming that they will utilise their professional skills in a meaningful manner amongst supportive professional colleagues to cooperative and appreciative clients. He stated that these expectations are unrealistic, in that the work with clients is often repetitive and unfruitful, the clients are rarely grateful, and bureaucratic constraints are plentiful with professionals often being isolated from each other.

In effect, this means that the new professional often finds that the job requirements and procedural limits actively block their aspirations. These contradictions arise from conflicts between organisational and individual control (Cherniss, 1980). Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) as well as Lee and Ashforth (1993) have noted that following the recognition of this kind of
dilemma, professionals become less interested in the intrinsic aspects of their work and more interested in the extrinsic rewards. Jackson et al. (1986) have also noted that many new professionals believe that the organisation will recognise and reward good performance, and that feelings of low personal accomplishment may result when the expected positive feedback is not received.

Several authors (e.g: Goroff, 1986; LeCroy & Rank, 1986; Leiter, 1991b) have agreed that an individual experiences burnout when confronted with contradictions between a desire to help others and the structural limitations and demands of the social services. Leiter (1991b) proposes that this contradiction is, in actual fact, a far more significant contributor to burnout than the demands placed upon the individual through client demands and contact. Moreover, he states that the new professional comes to the position unequipped to deal with organisational, rather than client based problems; they see organisational problem-solving as a waste of time, and that the effort required to effect change is considerable. Consequently, problem solving organisational dilemmas leaves the new professional feeling harassed, powerless and frustrated.

Van Harrison (1979) has built on the “Person-Environment Fit” research, and suggests that there are two kinds of fit between the individual and the environment. The first is the extent to which the person’s skills and abilities match the demands and requirements of the job. The second is the extent to which the job environment is able to meet the individual’s needs. He concludes that when a misfit threatens the individual’s well-being, some personal dysfunction is likely to occur. According to Otto (1983), stress occurs where there is a “lack of fit” between the person and the environment, or where it overtaxes the individual’s energy or resources. She states that while
every work environment will not be able to meet every person's needs due to the array of individual differences, it is a fallacy for organisations to conclude that the problem is with the employee. She reports that there is ample evidence to show that stress is widely generated by particular characteristics of work environments. Savicki and Cooley (1987) cite previous research, which has shown that high burnout levels have been associated with:

a) low worker impact on procedural and policy issues;
b) a lack of worker autonomy within the guidelines of the job structure;
c) a lack of clarity about work objectives and responsibilities.

Moos (1987a) claims that high work demands may lessen job morale and elicit strain and pervasive physical symptoms. Otto (1983) proposes that it is erroneous to attribute individual differences in vulnerability to personality characteristics without examining the cumulative impact of stress producing conditions in a person's work or life situation. She notes that it is crucial that these should be examined, as it is possible that the stressful conditions may be greater than most individuals' tolerance levels.

There has been a large amount of research into the correlates of burnout in the work environment. Demographic factors such as age, level of education, length of time in the job and amount of experience have all been shown to be linked to perceptions of work environments and levels of burnout (Chiriboga & Bailey, 1986; Grau, Chandler, Burton & Kolditz, 1991; Jupp & Shaul, 1991; Turnipseed & Turnipseed, 1991; Oktay, 1992). Oktay (1992) found when studying burnout in social workers who were working with AIDS patients, that the best predictors of burnout were consistently identified as belonging to a social support group, increased age, and autonomy in the job. Chiriboga and Bailey (1986), in a survey of 544 critical care and medical surgical unit nurses, found that the work environment setting and work stress variables contributed
most to the prediction of burnout. They also noted that the less experienced, younger nurses were more prone to burnout than the older, more experienced nurses.

Level of support within the working environment has been shown to be significant in terms of people's positive perception of their environment and their levels of burnout. Supervisor support, without reducing autonomy, has been identified as reducing the risk of burnout (Brown, 1986; Savicki & Cooley, 1987; Leiter, 1988), as has peer support and level of social interaction within the workplace (Brown, 1986; Savicki & Cooley, 1987; Leiter, 1988; Miller et al. 1990). However, Moos (1987a) warns that while cohesive relationships can assist in moderating stressful situations for many, highly independent or introverted people who prefer fewer social ties may feel hemmed in or overstimulated if relationships are too intense. Intensity of work, as reflected in factors such as number of, and degree of intensity of work with clients, has also been associated with burnout (Savicki & Cooley, 1987).

Friedlander and Greenberg (1971), studied the job performance and retention of 478 chronically unemployed people, and found that the sole correlate of their work effectiveness and ability to retain jobs was the extent to which they perceived their work environments to be supportive. Interestingly, Jayaratne, Himle and Chess (1988) in a study of perception and use of support in the work environment amongst 480 social workers, found that staff saw the utilisation of support networks as being beneficial. The results indicated that if staff considered the work environment as being supportive, it helped them to deal with work-related stress and strain. However, if the environment was perceived as being unsupportive, support at work was not utilised.
Moos (1986) has postulated that there are ten aspects which make up the social climate of the work environment. These are Involvement, Peer Cohesion, Supervisor Support, Autonomy, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Clarity, Control, Innovation and Physical Comfort. These assess three underlying dimensions:

a) the Relationship Dimension (comprised of Involvement, Peer Cohesion and Supervisor Support);

b) the Personal Growth Dimension (comprised of Autonomy, Task Orientation and Work Pressure);

c) the System Maintenance and Change Dimension (Clarity, Control, Innovation and Physical Comfort).

Each of the ten work environment aspects will be briefly discussed below.

1.4.1(i) Involvement

Involvement is defined as "the extent to which employees are concerned about and committed to their jobs" (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Maslach and Jackson (1981) found that involvement with people, while not being statistically significant enough to be included as a fourth factor of burnout, consistently appeared as a variable related to high emotional exhaustion in their research. Leiter (1991b) claims that changes in the nature and meaning of work have made careers more central to our sense of identity, and that this inherently makes satisfaction with performance more difficult to obtain. Kyriacou (1987) notes that it is possible that professionals, as a result of experiencing stress, lower their level of job involvement in terms of time and energy that they devote to their work, but found that this has a tendency to increase, rather than decrease, their likelihood of future burnout.
Robinson et al. (1991) in a study of 314 nurses in a large hospital found that low work involvement and low supervisor support resulted in high emotional exhaustion. All three aspects of burnout were influenced by a perception of high work pressure and low work involvement. Barone, Caddy, Kattell, Roselione and Hamilton (1988) found in four studies involving over 1300 workers, that frequency of organisational stress was moderately related to organisational commitment. Manlove (1993) found that organisational commitment was significantly associated with emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment, and was also linked to job satisfaction, performance, intent to quit, and self-reports of being burnt out. Interestingly, Perrewe, Fernandez and Morton (1993) posit that high commitment to one’s job or profession is a prerequisite to burnout. In their study of 226 undergraduate business students they found that perceptions of high burnout were related to heavy job demands and high responsibilities, with the implication of a high job commitment.

1.4.1(ii) Peer Cohesion

Peer cohesion is defined as “the extent to which employees are friendly and supportive of one another” (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Peer support has been found by many researchers to be a buffer against job stress and burnout (Marks & Hixon, 1986; Miller et al., 1990; Grau et al., 1991; Kruger, Botman & Goodenow, 1991; Huebner, 1993). Huebner (1993) has suggested that peers can play various roles and assist with technical help, comfort, insight, comparison, rewards and escape for each other. Leiter (1988) however, contends that coworker interactions are able to both aggravate and alleviate burnout. As did Moos (1987a), Leiter (1988) found that a large number of contacts with co-workers on work-oriented matters were related to higher feelings of accomplishment, but may also have contributed to higher emotional exhaustion. Informal contact
with co-workers, however, was related to higher levels of personal accomplishment as well as to increased job satisfaction. Rather than discouraging peer work-related discussions, Leiter suggests that there is a need for effective and supportive formats for peer supervision. He believes that this is important, as workers are capable of building supportive relationships among themselves that enhance both their job satisfaction and their sense of accomplishment.

Goroff (1986) suggests that peer supervision is a counteractive measure against the isolation that is experienced in a competitive situation. He notes that peers share with one another and receive comments from their colleagues, which they are then able to incorporate into their practise if they desire. He states that peer supervision differs from traditional supervision in that the “authority of position” is replaced by reciprocal influence.

Leiter (1988), while recognising that social contact provides direct benefits such as feelings of closeness and belonging, has proposed that burnout in human service organisations occurs to a large extent in a social context. He believes that most pressures are a result of social interactions, and states that work-oriented contact is fraught with peril, in that it is always possible that discussions about work will lead to additional demands being made on the worker. Conversely however, Leiter notes that peer support is an important factor in alleviating burnout, as the individual is able to receive recognition for accomplishments and, through casework discussions, draw on the expertise of colleagues (see also Goroff, 1986). He thus recommends enhancing the supportive aspects of co-worker communication, and states that this is an important aspect of managing human service organisations.
Other researchers suggest that co-worker support may be at low levels in a work setting because of conflict and competition between workers, and that the mutual sharing of problems may be viewed as weakness or incompetence (Maslach, 1982; Marks & Hixon, 1986; Himle, Jayaratne & Thyness, 1989). Himle et al. (1989) have posited that the effect of co-worker support may be weakened or discounted by the workers' ability to perceive the offered support as meaningful. Kahn (1993) extends this idea by suggesting that workers' abilities to either offer or seek care with their co-workers, is reflective of the worker's perception of their colleague's ability to perform their work-related roles effectively.

The importance of co-worker support within the working environment has been highlighted in a number of studies. Kruger et al. (1991) in their longitudinal study of 78 residential counsellors, found that measures of co-worker support, such as team cohesion and perceived quality of friendships, were better predictors of burnout than supervisor support. High levels of co-worker support were consistently and positively related to greater personal accomplishment. Grau et al. (1991), in a study of 219 nurses aides in two different nursing homes, found that the quality of the social environment of the nursing homes, (eg: warmth and friendliness of the nursing home and the support and caring of co-workers and superiors) was found to be as important as attitudes towards job benefits. Sandell and Sullivan (1992) found when interviewing teachers that informal influences such as discussions about the practice of teaching, opportunities to observe another's teaching and to learn from and teach one another, were deemed more significant than formal influences such as conferences, in-services, supervision and courses.
1.4.1(iii) Supervisor Support

Supervisor support is defined as "the extent to which management is supportive of employees and encourage employees to be supportive of one another" (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Hodgkinson (1985) states that the aim of individual supervision is to affirm the individual's direction in their work, to encourage developing skills, and to teach new ones. It allows a closer analysis of an individual's difficulties in a potentially less threatening environment than a staff group, and provides more opportunity for planning a comprehensive approach to tackling issues. It also allows for a closer analysis of strengths, so that more direct reinforcement and encouragement may be given.

Davis, Savicki, Cooley & Firth (1989) believe that because supervisors are responsible for the professional direction of employees, the importance of a relationship between supervisory behaviour and counsellor burnout cannot be overestimated. Their research found that dissatisfaction with supervision was positively related to frequency and intensity of emotional exhaustion and to intensity of depersonalisation. It was also negatively related to frequency of feelings of personal accomplishment.

Cherniss (1980, 1988) has stated that supervisors may be a key factor in the amelioration of burnout. Many other writers concur, and suggest that the importance of this variable can be related to all three factors of burnout (Jackson et al., 1986; Russell, Altmaier & Van Velzen, 1987; Seltzer & Numerof, 1988; Davis et al., 1989; Ross, Altmaier & Russell, 1989; Miller et al. 1990; Razza, 1993). Like peer support, Huebner (1993) and Razza (1993) argue that the supervisor is able to be either a major source of stress, or a significant figure in the prevention and management of burnout. Huebner (1993) states that
supervisors can provide technical assistance, feedback and support, especially for the younger, inexperienced professionals who are more prone to burnout.

Both Huebner (1993) and Razza (1993) state that one of the main advantages of being a supervisor is of being in a position to note signs of incipient burnout in their supervisees before the employee does, therefore assisting them in the prevention of burnout. Huebner states that the effective supervisor can increase their supervisee's feelings of confidence, competence and control, whereas the ineffective supervisor may increase the supervisee's negative feelings. Razza (1993) sees that a supportive supervisor can be crucial in the retention of employees. She states that a supervisor who is perceived as easily approachable, shows concern for the employee's feelings and opinions, and encourages the employee's self-expression, is likely to enhance the retention of staff.

Supervisory support may not always be effective in reducing work stress and burnout, since there may be a conflict of expectations regarding work performance between supervisors and workers (Maslach, 1982). Supervisory support may be given only for the quantitative aspects of the job, such as the number of clients interviewed, or the number of cases completed, while the worker may be seeking emotional support for the quality or difficulty of their work. Supervisors may also mix emotional support with criticism of performance, which may dilute the effectiveness of such support. Himle et al. (1989) state that the important factor "is not the mere presence of emotional support, but rather how, when, and why it is given" (p. 41).

Sandell and Sullivan (1992) suggest that supervision may have contributed to disillusionment among teachers. They found that the category of support, feedback, empathy, and understanding was the first or second most often
mentioned factor by teachers at all stages of professional development. They suggested that in terms of intervention, important aspects of supervision could include facilitating contact with professional development resources and allowing study breaks or leave. They found that both supervisors and supervisees agreed on the need for the training of supervisors.

Sandell and Sullivan (1992) noted that major barriers to effective professional development of staff in relation to supervisors were seen as being superficiality, formality, being judgmental and threatening, as well as the infrequency of supervision and the incompetence of the supervisor. These factors were all seen to be contributors to disillusionment. Thus, supervisors were recommended to establish positive supervisor-supervisee rapport, to get to know their supervisees, their interests, expertise, philosophy, and stage of development. They were encouraged to show kindness, to support the professional development process, and to focus on their own personal and professional development.

Interestingly, Sandell and Sullivan note that 95% of the teachers in their study claimed that their growth came from informal influences such as interactions with fellow teachers, and informal acts of the principals, such as showing interest, modelling appropriate behaviour, being available to discuss problems, recognising achievement, and encouraging experimentation. Cherniss (1988) supports this idea of emotional availability of supervisors towards staff. He recommends that supervisors might help reduce staff burnout by spending more time in planning, organising, and advocating for staff, and keeping them informed of important personnel matters such as impending redundancies, salary raises, fringe benefits and promotions.
Jayaratne et al. (1988) also support the emotional availability of supervisors. They suggest that having an opportunity to talk with a colleague or supervisor may enable a person to make a more realistic appraisal of the problems and solutions that individuals in similar situations encounter. They can then learn that the worker is not in an isolated struggle against unique problems, but in a common struggle against common problems. They believe that communication between colleagues and supervisors should encourage greater consistency between work experience and work expectations. Similar to Kahn (1993), they found that workers making low use of support were significantly more likely than those making high use of support to report that clients could not be helped, and that they had difficulty in getting useful feedback from them.

Barone et al. (1988), in four studies involving over 1300 workers, found that frequency of organisational stress was moderately related to satisfaction with supervision and work. Clark and Vaccaro (1987), in their study of 96 community health psychiatrists, found that job dissatisfaction was associated with lack of organisational administrative support.

The division in the literature in relation to Supervisor Support as a predictor of burnout appears to reflect the variable quality of supervision found in any profession. It is thought, however, that Huebner (1993) and Razza's (1993) proposition that the supervisor can either be a source of, or buffer against stress is most accurate, with the degree of stress experienced by workers most likely being a reflection of the extent of the supervisor's interpersonal and professional skills.
1.4.1(iv) **Autonomy**

Autonomy is defined as "the extent to which employees are encouraged to be self-sufficient and make their own decisions" (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Leiter (1991b) suggests that enhanced autonomy over the way in which services are provided could lead to a substantial decrease in the level of tedium for workers. LeCroy and Rank (1986) found that satisfaction, autonomy, self-esteem and discrepancy were important determinants of burnout. Miller et al. (1990) found that participation in decision-making had a direct effect on personal accomplishment and on work satisfaction. They concluded that perceptions of participation and influence on decision-making have a greater impact on burnout than more emotional forms of social support.

Melamed, Kushnir and Meir (1991), in a study of 267 female social workers, found that the positive and additive effects of perceived decision latitude and social support meant that more resources were available to the worker, and significantly reduced the effects from job demands on burnout and job dissatisfaction. Miller et al. (1990) have also stated that the greater the autonomy of the worker, and the more participation in decision making that is allowed, the greater opportunity there is for the worker to gain clarity about their role and thus decrease role conflict and ambiguity. They claim that increased participation allows employees to gain a clear understanding of what is expected and what is rewarded, thereby reducing uncertainty for the individual. Nowack (1991) found that supervisors who provided support without compromising autonomy were crucial to the reduction of burnout, whilst Leiter (1991b) suggested that enhancing workers' autonomy and developing a sense of their own competence would also reduce burnout.
1.4.1(v) Task Orientation

Task orientation is defined as "the degree of emphasis on good planning, efficiency, and getting the job done" (Moos, 1986, p. 2). To date, there has been a dearth of research on the effects of task orientation on burnout, although Robinson et al. (1991) found that personal accomplishment was predicted by task orientation, work pressure, involvement and age.

1.4.1(vi) Work Pressure

Work pressure is defined as "the degree to which the press of work and time urgency dominate the job milieu" (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Robinson et al. (1991), in their study of 314 nurses, found that all three aspects of burnout were influenced by the perception of high pressure and low work involvement. They concluded that experiencing excessive work pressure and limited participation may cause nurses to withdraw emotionally in order to cope with the working environment. Kirkcaldy et al. (1989) found that general job pressure was positively correlated with both job dissatisfaction and lack of relaxation and recreation and, to a lesser extent, problem relationships with coworkers.

1.4.1(vii) Clarity

Clarity is defined as "the extent to which employees know what to expect in their daily routine and how explicitly rules and policies are communicated" (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Miller et al. (1990) propose that role conflict exists when an individual has two or more role requirements that work against each other, and where the presence of role ambiguity provides uncertainty about what should be accomplished in the job. These factors add to the uncertainty about a
work situation and reduce the extent to which workers have control over their own jobs.

Many researchers found lack of clarity surrounding role expectations to be a significant predictor of burnout (Jackson et al., 1986; Himle et al., 1986; Huberty & Huebner, 1988; Himle & Jayaratne, 1990; Manlove, 1993; Barber & Iwai, 1996). Barber & Iwai (1996) surveyed 75 staff providing direct care to institutionalised elderly patients with Alzheimer's disease or a similar dementia. They found that work environment characteristics accounted for more than 60% of the explained variance in burnout, with the majority of the variance being explained by role conflict.

Huberty and Huebner (1988) found that poor clarity of role definition was identified as a major correlate of burnout in a study of 234 school counsellors. Jackson et al. (1986) reported that emotional exhaustion was strongly associated with role conflict, while Himle and Jayaratne (1990) found that for graduate social work students, work related stressors such as role conflict and role ambiguity were significant predictors of emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment. For postgraduate students however, they were significant predictors for all three facets of burnout. This would seem to indicate that even for employees with greater training and experience, role ambiguity remains a significant predictor of all three aspects of burnout.

Previous research has also found that there are sex differences in relation to role ambiguity. In their study of 617 clinical social workers, Himle et al. (1986) found that, while role ambiguity was a significant predictor of burnout for both men and women, decreased role ambiguity was associated with greater personal accomplishment for women, and associated with increased depersonalisation for men. They postulate that these differences may be
attributable to men feeling less comfortable in the clinical social worker role, and therefore they may attempt to detach themselves from it, leading to increased feelings of depersonalisation.

1.4.1(viii) Control

Control is defined as “the extent to which management uses rules and pressures to keep employees under control” (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Miller et al. (1990) have suggested that in order for individuals to have a sense of control over their environment, they seek out measures that will assist them in gaining an understanding of their workplace. They state that individuals seek social support in a focussed and goal-directed manner, to serve as a buffer against work stress and burnout. They also believe that individuals will strive to participate in decision-making in an attempt to reduce uncertainty and to exercise control over their work environment.

1.4.1(ix) Innovation

Innovation is defined as “the degree of emphasis on variety, change, and new approaches” (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Sandell and Sullivan (1992) found that environmental stimulation among teachers involved networking and sharing amongst staff from the same school or district, doing courses together, or becoming involved in collaborative projects. These experiences tended to combat boredom and caused stimulation for professional growth. Conferences, in-service training and encouragement of experimentation were all valued as important activities and experiences that developed environmental stimulation. Potter (1987) has suggested that innovation is important, and therefore that jobs should be tailored by the individual to meet their own needs. She states that jobs are elastic, and can be modified or “stretched”, and recommends that the
individual identifies goals and areas that need attending to, in order to tailor their job and provide their own professional stimulation.

1.4.1(x) Physical Comfort

Physical comfort is defined as "the extent to which the physical surroundings contribute to a pleasant work environment" (Moos, 1986, p. 2). Himle et al. (1986), in a study of 617 social workers, found that decreased job comfort was associated with greater irritation and depersonalisation, and increased job comfort was associated with a greater sense of personal accomplishment. Interestingly, these findings were valid for women only. The researchers suggest that interventions should target specific areas that were identified as a source of stress, such as travel to and from work, physical surroundings and working hours.

Thus, a variety of work factors have been identified as having an impact of workers' experience of burnout. These ten factors, identified by Moos as being generally applicable to all work environments, have all been associated to a varying degree with any, or all, of the three facets of burnout.

Despite this, there still remains the question of why in some work environments, some individuals burn out, while others do not. The alternate perspective on burnout would postulate that the work environment is less important than the internal beliefs and mechanisms that we bring to it. Internal coping resources are one mechanism that the individual utilises in order to deal with stressors in their everyday environment. Some of these will now be explored.
1.4.2 Coping Resources

Coping resources can be defined as characteristics, ongoing behaviours, or resources, which are inherent in individuals and enable them to handle stressors more effectively. They allow the individual to experience fewer or less intense symptoms upon exposure to a stressor, or to recover faster from exposure to a stressor (Folkman, Lazarus, Dunkel-Schetter, DeLongis & Gruen, 1986; Hammer & Marling, 1988; Zeidner & Hammer, 1990). Folkman et al. (1986) do not differentiate between "good" and "bad" coping, but state that coping is simply defined as an individual's efforts to manage demands, whether or not the efforts are successful.

Wheaton (1983) defines coping resources as personal resources that affect a variety of factors in the coping situation, such as the range of responses considered, the interpretation of the event itself, or the amount of effort having to be expended in order to cope. These resources may increase an individual's potential to deal effectively with stress. Baum and Singer (1982) view coping resources as adaptive capacities that protect individuals against damage from stress, and are also predispositions derived from genetic factors, environmental influences, and learned relationships. Kessler (1979) describes individuals with low resources as being vulnerable and constitutionally fragile, while Kobasa (1979) characterised those with high resources as hardy, and Kessler and Essex (1982) described them as resilient.

Constantini, Solano, Di Napoli and Bosco (1997) carried out a longitudinal study of 92 student nurses working in critical areas. They found that higher hardiness levels at the beginning of the nurses' second year of study were associated with lower emotional exhaustion and higher personal achievement scores at the end of the year, and therefore concluded that hardiness scores
were predictive of the risk of burnout. In contrast, Rowe (1997), when exploring the relationships between hardiness, stress, temperament, coping and burnout in a study of 448 health care professionals, found that hardiness did not account for a significant amount of the variance in burnout after stress and coping had entered the regression equations.

Hammer and Marting (1988) differentiate between coping resources which they see as "background factors" or "precursors of behavior", and coping strategies which they define as things that people do in reaction to a specific stressor occurring in a specific context. They state that it is possible for a strategy (something tried on one occasion) to become a resource (a pattern of behaviour), but that this would only be after the strategy had been employed repetitively over a period of time and with effect. They compare this to other strategies that may be tried, tested and then discarded, rather than becoming a resource. Folkman et al. (1986) and Terry (1991) note that an individual will choose their coping strategy based upon their coping resources and their appraisal of the event. They suggest that in this way, the subjective appraisal of the event can be more important than the objective characteristics on which the event can be described. Terry (1991) states that; “what is relevant to the prediction of coping is not how others would objectively rate an event (for instance, in terms of its controllability), but the individual’s own appraisal of the demands and nature of the situation” (p. 1032).

Zeidner and Hammer (1990) state that coping resources can be viewed in three ways, either as:
1. an antecedent factor that reduces the likelihood of undesirable events occurring;
2. having a buffering effect on the impact of stress once the event is experienced;
3. affecting the interpretation of the stressful event.

In this way, coping resources may intervene at three separate levels:
1. prior to the stressful event;
2. between an event and the personal strain that it stimulates;
3. between strain and the physical and psychological responses.

Hammer and Marting (1988) have promoted research on coping resources in the belief that coping resources are an important way to mediate stress, and that clinicians need to be aware of an individual's strengths as well as their weaknesses in order to design useful interventions and improve self-esteem. They have defined five resource dimensions on the basis of their clinical experience. These are: cognitive, social, emotional, spiritual/philosophical and physical resources. These will be briefly described below.

1.4.2(i) Cognitive Resources

Cognitive resources are described by Hammer and Marting (1988) as "the extent to which individuals maintain a positive sense of self worth, a positive outlook towards others, and optimism about life in general" (p. 3). Zeidner and Hammer (1990) studied 108 adolescents and found that of the five resources measured in a longitudinal study, cognitive resources and physical resources were the best predictors of psychosomatic symptoms. It was found that adolescents with more positive self-concepts and outlooks, and those engaging in health promoting behaviours, were less likely to report psychosomatic symptoms.

As a result of their research, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) proposed that negative evaluations of stressful situations could lead to psychological strain.
Lee and Ashforth (1993) hence suggested that emotional exhaustion may occur not only in response to perceived stress, but to negative feelings about the work situation as well. Rosenthal et al. (1989) cite a study by Jacobson (1983), where nurses were asked to indicate the coping strategies that they would employ for ten stressful situations that had been selected. From this, Jacobson identified three major coping factors: cognitive processing, using personal skills, and escape. All three of these strategies were used more commonly in high stress rather than in low stress situations. Jupp and Shaul (1991) assessed the effects of work stress and sources of support on burnout in student counsellors. They found that negative appraisals of work environments, and negative attitudes expressed about peers and clients, were significantly associated with self-assessments of burnout.

1.4.2(ii) Social Resources

Hammer and Marting (1988) define social resources as "the degree to which individuals are embedded in social networks that are able to provide support in times of stress" (p. 3). Many studies indicate that social support buffers the impact of stress on health by indirectly moderating the appraisal of stress, and directly contributing to psychological and physical well-being (Potter, 1987; Russell et al., 1987; Hetherington et al., 1989; Himle et al., 1989; Ross et al., 1989; Carr et al., 1996). Research in the burnout literature appears to have either focussed on social support within the working environment (Friedlander & Greenberg, 1971; Brown, 1986; Savicki & Cooley, 1987; Jayaratne et al., 1988; Leiter, 1988; Leiter & Maslach, 1988) or upon social support within a social/familial context (Holahan & Moos, 1982; Jayaratne et al., 1986; Leiter, 1990). Few studies appear to have addressed social resources as a total phenomenon incorporating both the work and personal spheres.
LeCroy and Rank (1986) surveyed 106 social workers and found that work environment factors had greater negative associations with burnout than personal coping mechanisms. They propose that as social workers are interactors and communicators, involvement and support from supervisors, co-workers and professional colleagues are an important factor in maintaining successful interaction with clients. Their results suggest the need for social workers to balance their giving to clients with effective positive supports, both within and outside the work environment.

Russell et al. (1987) found three aspects of social support that predicted burnout among teachers. These were support from their supervisor, reassurance of worth, and reliable alliance. In terms of social resources, reliable alliance was defined as having people available in your social network to whom you could turn for assistance in an emergency. It was also found to be associated with depersonalisation. They theorised that social support could be a means of gaining information about the work environment, as could participation in decision making. This would then serve to allow the individual to gain a sense of control over their environment.

Potter (1987) states that close friends and good relationships with both co-workers and family reaffirm the worker's sense of competence and self-worth. She notes that social networks can assist the individual to get things done and provide valuable information. Networks can help one cope with difficult situations and can provide feedback. They can assist the individual to learn new skills and can encourage them to tackle challenges and accomplish goals.

Ross et al. (1989) state that researchers have consistently found that people who have high levels of social support are in better physical and mental health. They found that counselling centre staff who reported having a network of
people who shared their interests and concerns showed less emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. Himle et al. (1989) surveyed 1038 social workers in Norway and the U.S.A. and found that emotional support by both supervisors and co-workers was associated with lower levels of burnout, work stress and mental health problems in both samples. Brown and O'Brien (1998) in their study of 91 crisis intervention shelter workers, found that perceived social support from a supervisor and perceived social support from friends and family were both negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation.

Gender differences have also been found in relation to how individuals utilise social support. Some of the first research in this regard was by Holahan and Moos in 1982, when they surveyed 534 adult family members. They found that the quality of social support could help to predict psychosomatic complaints and feelings of depression after all other variables had been controlled for. Results indicated that support in family and work environments was differentially related to health for men and women. Holahan and Moos (1982) suggest that the work environment was considerably more important as a source of social support for men than for women, and that the family environment provided an especially potent source of social support for unemployed women. Interestingly, this was a study conducted in 1982, and with the increasing number of women employed full-time this situation appears to have changed over the last decade, as is evidenced in the recent research by Leiter and his colleagues (1994).

In a review of other studies, Leiter et al. (1994) found that women are more sensitive than men to imbalances in their personal and emotional investments in their occupations. Women who were highly invested in their jobs were more likely to report burnout than women who were not, whereas men
showed little difference in burnout as a function of the equity balance in their jobs. These findings point to potential differences in the manner in which women use support networks, and the extent to which they feel empowered in the work setting relative to men. Leiter et al. (1994) also found in their own research that women who were isolated from their social support networks tended to have a greater perceived sense of stress as indicated by greater emotional exhaustion scores and increased psychosomatic symptoms.

Stav, Florian and Shurka (1986), in their study of 112 social workers in Israel, suggested that there were cross-cultural differences in the formation and utilisation of social support. Burnout scores of the sample in their research were relatively lower in comparison to American results, with their results being consistent with other studies conducted in Israel. They theorised that sociocultural factors which are unique to Israel may explain the difference. They state that the greater emphasis on social unity and informality in interpersonal relationships in Israel provides a sound basis for the creation of a social support system. In America, however, they believe that the emphasis on competitiveness, excellence and personal achievement may contribute to the burnout process. This comparison has not been made with an Australian sample, however, it would be of interest given that Australians generally perceive themselves as being informal within relationships while still striving for personal achievement in a competitive environment.

1.4.2(iii) Emotional Resources

Emotional resources are defined by Hammer and Marting (1988) as “the degree to which individuals are able to accept and express a range of affect, based on the premise that a range of emotional responses aids in ameliorating long-term negative consequences of stress” (p. 3). This view supports the research of
Jayaratne et al. (1988) who found that in a working environment that was perceived to be supportive, social workers were able to express a need for, and then benefit from this support. In a study of 138 first year psychology students Terry (1991) found that there were gender differences in terms of who utilised emotional resources, in that females sought more emotional support as a coping resource than did males. Himle et al. (1989) found that emotional support was positively associated with job satisfaction and personal accomplishment in a survey of 1038 social workers in Norway and America.

1.4.2(iv) Spiritual/Philosophical Resources

Hammer and Marting (1988) define spiritual/philosophical resources as "the degree to which actions of individuals are guided by stable and consistent values derived from religious, familial, or cultural tradition or from personal philosophy" (p. 3). They postulate that such values might help define the meaning of potentially stressful events and prescribe strategies for responding effectively.

Turnipseed and Turnipseed (1991), in a study of 117 nurses, noted that the amount of coping resources, but in particular, age, strength of religious beliefs and plans to retire from the present job, were significant covariates of burnout. Turnipseed (1994) studied 115 registered and practical nurses at an urban hospital and found that peer cohesion, work pressure, supervisor support, job clarity and autonomy were work environment variables linked to burnout. However, he found that time on the job and the intensity of religious beliefs served as moderators of the influence of the work environment on burnout.
1.4.2(v) Physical Resources

Physical resources are defined as "the degree to which individuals enact health-promoting behaviors believed to contribute to increased physical well-being" (Hammer & Marting, 1988, p. 3), such as being aware of diet, and the inclusion of regular exercise as a part of an individual's lifestyle. Physical well-being is thought to decrease the level of negative response to stress and enable faster recovery. Hammer and Marting (1988) also believe that it may help to reduce potentially chronic stress-illness cycles. Brown (1986), Nowack (1991) and Langemo (1998) all found that increased levels of physical exercise were negatively correlated to perceived stress and burnout.

Thus, internal coping resources have also been found to contribute to the individual's experience of burnout. Like the aspects of work environment, each of the five domains of internal coping resources has individually been found to be linked to the employee's experience of burnout.

Thus, in terms of the current research, the focus will be to integrate these alternate theories in order to examine the interactive effects of the individual's working environment and their own internal coping resources.

1.5 A Person-Environment Model of Burnout

Researchers have proposed interactive models of burnout which combine various demographic, work-related and personal characteristics with emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1977; Perlman & Hartman, 1982; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Seltzer & Numerof, 1988; Ivancevich, Matteson, Freedman & Phillips, 1990; Huebner,
1993; Schulz et al., 1995; Brown & O’Brien, 1998). Miller et al. (1990) state that an integrated focus in which perceptions of workplace stressors, support, participation, burnout and attitudinal outcomes are studied systematically, can dramatically alter information about burnout within a given environment, as well as providing further information for the development of appropriate interventions.

1.5.1 The Current Study

The conceptual model proposed for this study is an interactive one, where the purpose is to examine the relative contributions of the independent variables (internal coping resources and perceptions of the external working environment) on the dependent variable (burnout). Thus, the aim of the study is to assess which of the individual dimensions of the five internal coping resources and the ten work environment aspects best predicts the three areas that comprise burnout. These areas are also reflected in the hypotheses.
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Figure 1. Shows the conceptual model of burnout, which aims to look at the individual dimensions of the working environments and their interaction with internal coping resources, in order to see which combination of these internal and external resources can best predict levels of burnout in workers.
1.6 Aims and Rationale of Study 1

The application of theory to model suggests a way in which the person vs environment theories of burnout may be melded. Thus, Study 1 aims to examine the personal resources and the work environment aspects that are associated with staff burnout in child protection workers.

It was believed that in identifying some of the factors that contribute to burnout, there may be some interventions that could be employed to reduce the risk of this phenomenon. Ideally, it is envisaged that in identifying which coping resources aid staff in dealing with stress in the workplace, these resources could then be promoted through staff development programmes. In addition, by identifying which aspects of the workplace people find most stressful, further training for management, and additional physical resources may be able to be put into place. This information could then be utilised by the Department of Community Services to ameliorate the high turnover of new staff that is currently occurring.

1.7 Main Aims

1. To investigate the demographic factors that are related to burnout.

2. To investigate the relationship between individual coping resources and level of burnout.

3. To investigate the relationship between individual experience of the working environment and level of burnout.
4. To investigate whether the levels of burnout in a person can be predicted by the combination of their perceptions of the work environment and their internal coping resources.

1.8 Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Individuals who are identified as being emotionally exhausted will (a) experience high levels of work pressure, and low levels of involvement, supervisor support, autonomy, clarity and control in their working environment; and (b) will have low levels of social, cognitive, and emotional resources.

Hypothesis 2: Individuals who are identified as having a high sense of depersonalisation will (a) experience high levels of task orientation and work pressure and low levels of autonomy, involvement, and supervisor support in their working environments; and (b) will also have low levels of emotional, social and cognitive resources.

Hypothesis 3: Individuals who are identified as having a high sense of personal accomplishment will (a) experience high levels of work pressure, involvement, autonomy, supervisor support and clarity subscales in their working environments; and (b) will have high levels of physical, cognitive, social and emotional resources.

Hypothesis 4: Women will score higher on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) than men, while men will score higher on the Depersonalisation subscale than women.
Hypothesis 5: Women who score higher on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale of the MBI will (a) score lower on the Social Resources scale of the Coping Resources Inventory (CRI), and (b) will show a greater need for social support networks than men.

Hypothesis 6: Low Supervisor Support scores on the Work Environment Scale (WES) will be correlated with high scores on Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation and low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscales of the MBI.

Hypothesis 7: Older people will have lower scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales, and higher scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale of the MBI.

Hypothesis 8: Compared to less experienced workers, more experienced workers in the child protection field will have lower scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales, and higher scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale of the MBI.

Hypothesis 9: Respondents who label themselves as having attained higher levels of education will have lower scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales, and higher scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale of the MBI.

Hypothesis 10: Workers who are either married or in de facto relationships will have lower scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales and higher scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale of the MBI, than people who are not married or in de facto relationships.
Hypothesis 11: Workers who have children will have lower scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales and higher scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale of the MBI than workers who do not have children.
CHAPTER 2

Study 1: Method

2.1 Participants

Subjects were District Officers from the Department of Community Services. While permission was sought from the Department to administer a questionnaire to all District Officers employed by the Department, only the Metropolitan North District Officers were allowed to participate in the study. This area covered seventeen Community Services Centres, ranging from Katoomba to Wyong and to Bondi. The questionnaire was given to 196 District Officers, of whom 122 responded, giving a 62.2% response rate. Due to lack of statistical data from the Department, it was not possible to gauge how representative this sample was of the general employee population in terms of age, sex, marital status and length of employment.

2.2 Measures

A number of measures were used to test the hypotheses. Subjects were asked to respond to three different scales compiled into one questionnaire. A demographic data form and consent form were included with the questionnaire (see Appendix A), as was a covering letter giving details and information about the study (see Appendix B). The scales were randomly ordered for each questionnaire. The scales were:

- The Maslach Burnout Inventory - MBI, (Maslach and Jackson, 1986)
- The Work Environment Scale - WES, (Moos, 1986: modified form)
• The Coping Resources Inventory - CRI, (Hammer & Marting, 1988)
• Demographic Data

The Maslach Burnout Inventory, or MBI (Maslach and Jackson, 1986), has been widely used in the measurement of burnout in a number of service provider professions. The MBI is designed to assess three aspects of the burnout syndrome: emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and lack of personal accomplishment. Each of these is defined by a separate subscale. The Emotional Exhaustion subscale is made up of 9 questions such as “I feel emotionally drained from my work” and “I feel like I’m at the end of my rope”. Depersonalisation was calculated from responses to 5 questions such as “I feel I treat some recipients as if they were impersonal objects” and “I’ve become more callous since I took this job”. Personal Accomplishment was reflected in responses to 8 questions such as “I feel I’m positively influencing other people’s lives through my work” and “I feel exhilarated after working closely with my recipients”.

A high degree of burnout is reflected in high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales, and in low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. An average degree of burnout is reflected in average scores on the three scales. A low degree of burnout is reflected in low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation subscales and in high scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. Therefore there is no overall score for the respondent for burnout, but three separate scores. The reliability coefficients range from 0.71 to 0.90, with good internal validity being reported.

The Work Environment Scale, or WES (Moos, 1986), is a scale that has been designed to measure social interaction factors in the work environment. In
order to aid administration to participants and to encourage and maintain participation and cooperation, the scale was adapted to a short form, using only the first forty items. This is a technique Moos has utilised with a number of the Social Climate Scales (Classroom Environment Scale, 1987b; University Residence Environment Scale, 1987c; Ward Atmosphere Scale, 1987d, etc.). It was hoped that by reducing the number of items in the total questionnaire, it would keep the response time to under 30 minutes, as other research has demonstrated that test length is related to reliability (Jones, 1991; Schmitt, 1996). As this is an unstandardised version of the scale, no normative data are available. A peripheral aim of this study was to examine the reliability of subscale scores for the short form of this scale.

The WES consists of three dimensions: relationships, personal growth, and system maintenance and change, which are then divided into ten subscales. As previously mentioned, for the relationship dimension these are: involvement, peer cohesion, and supervisor support; for the personal growth dimension: autonomy, task orientation and work pressure; for the system maintenance and change dimension: clarity, control, innovation and physical comfort. The revised short form of the scale includes four items from each of the subscales.

The revised measure comprises forty statements about the work environment, to which the respondent circled either True or False, depending upon how representative that statement was of their work environment. Representative questions for each of the subscales are as follows:

**Involvement** -
- "There's not much group spirit";
- "People seem to take pride in the organization";

**Peer Cohesion** -
- "People go out of their way to make a new employee feel comfortable";
- "Employees rarely do things together after work";
Supervisor Support - “Supervisors tend to talk down to their employees”;  
“Supervisors usually compliment an employee who does something well”;  

Autonomy -  
“Employees are encouraged to make their own decisions”;  
“People can use their own initiative to do things”;  

Task orientation -  
“There’s a lot of time wasted because of inefficiencies”;  
“Things rarely get ‘put off till tomorrow’”;  

Work Pressure -  
“There is constant pressure to keep working”;  
“There always seems to be an urgency about everything”;  

Clarity -  
“Things are sometimes pretty disorganised”;  
“Rules and regulations are somewhat vague and ambiguous”;  

Control -  
“There’s a strict emphasis on following policies and regulations”;  
“People can wear wild looking clothes while on the job if they want”;  

Innovation -  
“Doing things in a different way is valued”;  
“New and different ideas are always being tried out”;  

Physical Comfort -  
“Work space is awfully crowded”;  
“This place has a stylish and modern appearance”.  

Scoring was carried out according to the manual, with each scale, as well as each dimension, having its own score. The intercorrelations between the scales for the standardised measure have been shown to account for less than 10% of the subscale variance, and Cronbach's Alpha (Cronbach, 1951) is within an acceptable range, varying from moderate to substantial. Savicki and Cooley (1987) report that the WES was standardised on a sample of over 3,000 workers, with Cronbach's Alpha ranging from 0.69 to 0.86 for the ten scales, and the test-retest data correlations after one month ranging from 0.69 to 0.83.
The Coping Resources Inventory, or CRI (Hammer & Marting, 1988). This was developed in order to provide a tool for identifying resources available to individuals for managing stress and to emphasise resources rather than deficits. The CRI is made up of five scales, each representing a different domain: cognitive, social, emotional, spiritual/philosophical, and physical. The inventory is made up of 60 items and utilises a 4 point scale to indicate how often the respondent has engaged in the behaviour described in the item over the past six months. The Cognitive Resources subscale is made up of 9 statements, with items such "I feel as worthwhile as anyone else" and "I actively look for the positive side of people and situations". The Social Resources subscale comprises 13 items such as "I am part of a group, other than my family, that cares about me" and "I am comfortable with the number of friends I have". The Emotional Resources subscale contains 16 items such as "I can cry when sad" and "I express my feelings clearly and directly". The Spiritual/Philosophical Resources subscale has 11 items such as "I know what is important in life" and "I accept the mysteries of life and death". The Physical subscale contains responses to 11 items such as "I exercise vigorously 3-4 times a week" and "I eat well-balanced meals". Scores for each scale are the sum of item responses, with negatively worded items recoded. Scoring gives not only a total score for resources (the higher the number the greater the amount of coping resources), but also a breakdown of the individual domains. The scale has a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.91 and good internal validity.

2.3 Procedure

It was proposed that the researcher would travel to each of the Community Services Centres in the Metropolitan North Division in order to administer the questionnaires. It was possible to arrange this with thirteen out of the
seventeen centres. Four of the centres were not able to be visited. Questionnaires were then sent to these centres with a covering letter requesting respondents to complete and return. It is standard procedure that each Community Services Centre has a Team Meeting once a week. The researcher attended these meetings, described the purpose of the study, and then asked whether the workers were willing to participate. Confidentiality and overall feedback at the end of the study was assured. Each questionnaire was contained in a stamped, self-addressed envelope to ensure privacy and returned to the researcher's home address. A reminder letter was then sent to each District Officer, two to three weeks after the initial visit (see Appendix C).

The questionnaires were then scored according to the guidelines set out in their respective manuals.
CHAPTER 3

Results

The results of Study 1 are reported below. Results indicate that burnout was prevalent amongst the participants, although not all of the research hypotheses were supported.

3.1 Sample

The sample was drawn from the Metropolitan North Division of the Department of Community Services. Table 1 presents the Community Services Centres that were involved in the study, and the percentage of respondents from each centre that contributed data to the whole sample.

Table 1

Relative Contributions Towards the Sample by Centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>St. Leonards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katoomba</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>Mt. Druitt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>St. Marys</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Wyong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woy Woy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=122
The main contributors to the sample were Blacktown, St. Marys, Mt. Druitt, Wyong, Parramatta, Manly, Bondi, Auburn and Katoomba offices, with participants from these offices constituting just under \( \frac{3}{4} \) of the total sample.

Summary statistics for the sample for Sex, Age, Area, Religion, Marital Status, Length of Marriage, and number of children, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Sex, Age, Area, Religion, Marital Status, Length of Marriage, and Number of Children for the Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age in Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55-60 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60-64 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De facto</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>No children</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Catholic</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1 to 3 children</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4 to 9 children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample was shown to be consistent with other studies of child protection workers, in that it was predominantly female (Fryer et al. 1988; McGee, 1989;
Vinokur-Kaplan, 1991; Sandford et al., 1997). Due to the limitation of only sampling the Metropolitan North Division, it was also mainly urban. The age of the sample ranged from 20 to 64 years ($M = 35.39$ years), with most respondents being married (63.6%), and either having no children (44.6%), or between 1 and 3 children (46.3%). The majority of the sample defined themselves as being either Protestant (29.5%), Catholic (26.2%), or not religious (31.5%).

Education status and employment demographics were also requested from respondents. Summary statistics are provided in Table 3.

**Table 3**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp'd High Sch.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Tertiary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp'd Tertiary</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post Grad.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp'd Post Grad.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dip. Welf. Stud.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Arts</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Psych.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bach. Soc. Work</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Employment in Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The bulk of subjects in the sample had completed tertiary studies (approximately 50%), with just under 20% having only completed high school or part of their tertiary education. The main disciplines of study undertaken were the Diploma in Welfare Studies, Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Social Work. Many people had completed degrees in other areas such as education, legal studies and nursing. Nearly all staff were employed full time (94.3%); 71.1% of the sample had been employed in their current position for five years or less, with the majority of the sample (90.8%) having been employed for 10 years or less. This left only 8.8% as having had more than 10 years experience in their current child protection position.

3.2 Maslach Burnout Inventory

Means, ranges, standard deviations and Cronbach's Alpha (Cronbach, 1951) were calculated for each of the three subscales of the MBI as shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>27.48</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>4-52</td>
<td>0.89 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0-22</td>
<td>0.74 (5 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>32.18</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>16-47</td>
<td>0.80 (8 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maslach Burnout Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71 (22 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the subscales on the MBI showed a wide range of scores. The Cronbach's Alphas were similar to those reported by Maslach and Jackson (0.90 for
Emotional Exhaustion; 0.79 for Depersonalisation; and 0.71 for Personal Accomplishment). The means and standard deviations for Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment were also similar to those reported by Maslach and Jackson (1986) for the Social Services (\(N=1,538, M=7.46, SD=5.11\) for Depersonalisation; \(N=1,538, M=32.75, SD=7.71\) for Personal Accomplishment), but were higher than those reported for Emotional Exhaustion (\(N=1,538, M=21.35, SD=10.51\)).

3.3 Work Environment Scale

Table 5 presents the means, standard deviations, ranges and Cronbach's Alphas for each of the ten subscales of the Work Environment Scale.
Table 5

Summary Statistics for the Ten Subscales of the Work Environment Scale, and Cronbach's Alpha for the Full Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.56 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Cohesion</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.62 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.66 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.57 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.49 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>0.54 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.58 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.48 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.59 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0.31 (4 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81 (40 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary statistics were not able to be compared to Moos' standardised Work Environment Scale results due to the differences in number of scale items. The Cronbach's Alphas reported here are considerably lower than those reported by Moos. This is to be expected however, given the small number of items per subscale and the fact that these results are a comparison of 17 different centres rather than just one homogeneous environment. It is thought likely that the lack of a homogeneous working environment affected the internal consistency of the revised scale. The Task Orientation (0.49), Control (0.48) and Comfort (0.31) subscales had particularly low Cronbach's Alpha levels, and these are probably a reflection of the diversity of working environments and management styles which staff experience between the different offices.
Nonetheless, it was decided to retain the scales for the analyses so as to gauge their value (despite the limitations) as significant predictors of the three burnout subscales. As Control and Comfort were not found to be significant predictors of any of the MBI subscales in Study 1, they were eliminated from the conceptual model with only Task Orientation remaining as a significant predictor of Depersonalisation.

It would seem that, based on the Cronbach's Alphas, the modified form of the WES lacks the internal consistency of the original WES scale. While it may have been possible to try and increase the alpha rates by reducing items from each of the subscales, it was thought that this would most likely further compromise the underlying theoretical constructs of the subscales. It was noted that these would already have been affected by the initial scale item reduction (9 items to 4). It was thus decided that further research (Study 2) should include all nine items from each of the subscales (rather than just the first four items) to maximise internal consistencies.

3.4 Coping Resources Inventory

Table 6 provides summary statistics for the Coping Resources Inventory.
Summary Statistics for the Five Subscales of the Coping Resources Inventory and Cronbach's Alpha for the Full Scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Resources</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>16-36</td>
<td>0.87 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Resources</td>
<td>40.81</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>26-51</td>
<td>0.84 (13 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Resources</td>
<td>47.36</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>24-85</td>
<td>0.72 (16 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Resources</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>16-43</td>
<td>0.82 (11 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Resources</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>11-42</td>
<td>0.81 (11 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Resources Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.92 (60 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Normality of scale scores was also examined. Skew was evident in several variables (Depersonalisation, Peer Cohesion, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Clarity, Innovation, Cognitive Resources and Social Resources). Although the WES subscales were the most highly skewed, they should not strictly be treated as continuous variables as the WES items are scored "True/False" only. The correlation is at best only an indicator of association because the variables are not continuous. While the methods of analysis used are fairly robust, these departures from normality mean that any results should be viewed cautiously and interpretations should take into account the possible violations of the normality assumption.

For the remaining variables (Depersonalisation, Cognitive Resources and Social Resources), the skew, while significant, was not as extreme and the robustness of procedures used should be sufficient to overcome these milder violations of the normality assumption. Transformation of the variables was not performed as Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) state that an analysis is interpreted from the variables that are in it, and transformed variables can be hard to interpret. They note that if the scale is meaningful or widely used (as is the case with these latter variables), then transformation is often a hindrance to interpretation.

Table 7 gives the Pearson Correlation Coefficients Matrix for selected variables.
Table 7


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Emot</th>
<th>Deper</th>
<th>Pers</th>
<th>Inv</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Supv</th>
<th>Auton</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Clar</th>
<th>Cont</th>
<th>Innov</th>
<th>Conf</th>
<th>Cogve</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Emot</th>
<th>Spirit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emot Exh'n</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonal'n</td>
<td>-29**</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Acct</td>
<td>-34**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>-32**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Cohesion</td>
<td>-22**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supv. Support</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orient'n</td>
<td>-30**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity</td>
<td>-34**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>-32**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Res.</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Res.</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Res.</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Res.</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Res.</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 122  
*p<.05  
**p<.01
Emotional Exhaustion scores showed significant positive correlations with Depersonalisation and Work Pressure, and significant negative correlations with Personal Accomplishment, Involvement, Peer Cohesion, Task Orientation, Clarity, Comfort, and all five of the resource subscales. This is to be expected given that social interaction, clear definition of role within the workplace and physical comfort are thought to be associated with job satisfaction.

Depersonalisation scores were found to show a significant positive correlation with Work Pressure, and negative correlations with Personal Accomplishment, Task Orientation, Clarity, and Cognitive, Social, Emotional and Physical Resources. Again this is expected, as positive resources should act as a buffer for staff to help them stay involved with their clients and their work.

Personal Accomplishment scores were significantly positively correlated with Involvement, Clarity, Comfort, and all five of the resource subscales. This confirms the relationships of all three facets of burnout with the Coping Resource subscales. For this sample, involvement with co-workers and clarity of task and comfort within the workplace have been found to be positively associated with a sense of competence and well-being when combined with the workers' own positive personal resources.

3.6 Levels of Burnout

In order to obtain a broad view of the level of burnout experienced by respondents, the sample was divided into each of the levels of the burnout subscales (low, moderate, high). This information is presented in Table 8.
Table 8

Percentages of the Sample for Levels of Experienced Burnout on Each of the Burnout Subscales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Low %</th>
<th>Moderate %</th>
<th>High %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low, moderate and high ranges of the three facets of burnout were determined by the cut-off score levels given by Maslach and Jackson (Emotional Exhaustion: low=0-16, moderate=17-26, high=27+; Depersonalisation: low=0-6, moderate=7-12, high=13+; Personal Accomplishment: low=39+, moderate=32-38, high=0-31).

Table 8 indicates that over half (52.5%) of the sample were experiencing high levels of Emotional Exhaustion at the time of the survey, that a quarter (24.4%) were experiencing high levels of Depersonalisation, and that a quarter (23.3%) of the sample were experiencing low levels of Personal Accomplishment. Maslach and Jackson (1986) have indicated that Emotional Exhaustion is the most significant contributor to the individual's experience of burnout. These results therefore suggest that 85.5% of staff surveyed are reporting moderate-high levels of burnout. This would seem to reinforce earlier research on staff morale in the Department of Community Services and indicate that staff have significant needs that are not being met.
3.7 Facets of Burnout

In order to determine the significant predictors of each of the three facets of burnout, a series of multiple regression analyses were performed with Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment as the dependent variables. Sex, age, marital status, number of children, and the subscales of the WES (Involvement, Peer Cohesion, Supervisor Support, Autonomy, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Clarity, Control, Innovation, Comfort) and the CRI (Cognitive, Social, Emotional, Spiritual/Philosophical and Physical Resources) were the independent variables.

Three preliminary stepwise multiple regressions were initially conducted, with each of the three burnout factors serving as the dependent variable and the demographic factors and WES and CRI subscales as the independent variables. The preliminary analysis fitted all possible predictive variables into a regression model which entailed a listwise omission of cases with missing values. While this method enabled identification of the likely significant predictors, it reduced the sample size substantially (eg: from 113 cases to 96 for Emotional Exhaustion). It was then decided that further analyses should be conducted to try and increase the number of cases in each data set, which would also increase the validity of the results.

Thus, following the preliminary analysis, further stepwise multiple regressions were conducted for each of the burnout factors. This entailed using each of the burnout factors as the dependent variable and using the significant predictors identified in the preliminary analysis as the independent variables. This meant that missing data from other non-significant subscales were not included in the regression model and significantly increased the number of cases in the data
set (up to 20%). The details from these final models are presented in the results below.

3.7.1 Hypothesis 1: Predictors of Emotional Exhaustion

A preliminary stepwise regression analysis was carried out in order to identify the significant predictive variables that contribute to Emotional Exhaustion (dependent variable). These were then fitted into a final model. Work Pressure, Cognitive Resources, Involvement and Supervisor Support constituted the final model (independent variables), and are presented here in Table 9. This reduction of variables led to a significant increase in the number of cases included in the analysis, due to missing data having been excluded from other variables and cases. This increased the data set from 96 to 113 cases (addition of 17 cases).

Table 9

Stepwise Multiple Regression with Involvement, Supervisor Support, Work Pressure and Cognitive Resources as Independent Variables: Emotional Exhaustion (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Work Pressure (WES)</td>
<td>4.484</td>
<td>0.402</td>
<td>5.029</td>
<td>&lt;0.00005</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cognitive Resources (CRI)</td>
<td>-0.662</td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>-4.034</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involvement (WES)</td>
<td>-2.866</td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>-3.703</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supervisor Support (WES)</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>2.034</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 42.2\%$  \hspace{1cm} Adjusted $R^2 = 0.400$

Work Pressure, Cognitive Resources, Involvement and Supervisor Support were significant predictors of Emotional Exhaustion on the MBI, and collectively accounted for 42% of the variance for this sample.
The positive relationship between Emotional Exhaustion, Work Pressure and Supervisor Support indicates that for every unit increase on the Work Pressure scale, there is, on average, a corresponding increase of 4.5 points on the Emotional Exhaustion scale. Additionally, for every unit increase on the Supervisor Support scale, there is, on average, a corresponding 1.3 unit increase on the Emotional Exhaustion scale. These results suggest that high scores on Work Pressure and Supervisor Support are predictive of high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale.

The negative relationship between Emotional Exhaustion, Cognitive Resources and Involvement indicates that for every unit increase on the Cognitive Resources scale, there is, on average, a corresponding decrease of 0.7 units on the Emotional Exhaustion scale. In addition, for every unit increase on the Involvement scale, there is, on average, a corresponding 2.9 unit decrease on the Emotional Exhaustion scale. These results indicate that Cognitive Resources and Involvement in the workplace may serve as buffers against Emotional Exhaustion.

In the final model, with the extra cases included (approximately 20%), Supervisor Support explained a smaller proportion of the variance in the Depersonalisation variable (2.2%), than in the preliminary analysis (3.4%). Its value as a predictor in the final model was also of marginal significance ($p = 0.044$ compared with 0.0182 in the preliminary analysis). These conflicting results render the value of Supervisor Support as a predictor of Emotional Exhaustion as questionable, and would indicate that the value of Supervisor Support as a predictive variable of Emotional Exhaustion requires further examination.
Further examination of Supervisor Support as a variable would particularly be recommended as it acted in the opposite direction than expected from the literature, which suggested that low levels of Supervisor Support should be indicative of high levels of Emotional Exhaustion. Due to the theoretical importance which has been placed on the support of a supervisor as a highly contributory factor towards burnout, the current model will be retained for Study 2, with a view to clarifying the role of Supervisor Support as a predictor of Emotional Exhaustion.

These results partially supported Hypothesis 1, which proposed that high work pressure and low cognitive resources would be predictive of high emotional exhaustion. The other associations proposed in Hypothesis 1 were not supported.

3.7.2 Hypothesis 2: Predictors of Depersonalisation

Results of the final second stepwise multiple regression model with Sex, Age, Task Orientation, Innovation and Cognitive Resources as the independent variables, and Depersonalisation as the dependent variable are presented in Table 10.
Table 10

Stepwise Multiple Regression with Sex, Age, Task Orientation, Innovation and Cognitive Resources as Independent Variables: Depersonalisation (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cognitive Resources (CRI)</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>-0.345</td>
<td>-4.264</td>
<td>&lt;0.00005</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age</td>
<td>-0.784</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
<td>-3.578</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex</td>
<td>2.566</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>2.688</td>
<td>0.0083</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Task Orientation (WES)</td>
<td>-1.725</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>-3.155</td>
<td>0.0021</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Innovation (WES)</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>2.287</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = 33.6\% \quad \text{Adjusted } R^2 = 0.304 \]

Cognitive Resources, Age, Sex, Task Orientation and Innovation were found to be significant predictors of Depersonalisation, accounting for 34\% of the variance for this sample. The results support the theoretical perspective that males tend to be more Depersonalised than females.

The positive relationship between Depersonalisation and Innovation indicates that for every unit increase on the Innovation scale, there is, on average, a corresponding 1.0 unit increase on the Depersonalisation scale. These results indicate that Innovation in the workplace is predictive of Depersonalisation, and men are more likely to be depersonalised than women.

The negative relationship between Depersonalisation, Cognitive Resources, Age and Task Orientation indicates that for every unit increase on the Cognitive Resources scale, there is, on average, a corresponding decrease of 0.4 units on the Depersonalisation scale. For every unit increase on the Age scale, there is, on average, a corresponding 0.78 unit decrease on the Depersonalisation scale. In addition, for every unit increase on the Task Orientation scale, there is, on average, a corresponding 1.7 unit decrease on the Depersonalisation scale. Although the magnitude of these effects is small, the
variables are highly statistically significant as predictors. These results indicate that good Cognitive Resources, being older and having a good sense of Task Orientation in the workplace may serve as buffers against Depersonalisation.

These results generally negate the proposition of Hypothesis 2, that high depersonalisation would be predicted by high task orientation and work pressure and low autonomy, involvement, supervisor support, emotional and social resources. The results do support the proposition in Hypothesis 2 that low cognitive resources would be predictive of depersonalisation.

3.7.3 Hypothesis 3: Predictors of Personal Accomplishment

As with the first two facets of burnout, two stepwise regression models were carried out in order to identify significant predictors of Personal Accomplishment (preliminary and final modelling). The first included all the demographic data as well as the fifteen subscales of the WES and CRI as the independent variables and Personal Accomplishment as the dependent variable. The results are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cognitive Resources (CRI)</td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>3.649</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social Resources (CRI)</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>2.206</td>
<td>0.0299</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 35.1\%$  
Adjusted $R^2 = 0.338$
Table 11 identifies Cognitive and Social Resources as being significant predictors of Personal Accomplishment at the 0.05 level, together accounting for 35% of the variance. No working environment factors were found to account for the variance at a significant level.

The positive relationship between Personal Accomplishment, Cognitive Resources and Social Resources indicates that for every unit increase on the Cognitive Resources scale there is, on average, a corresponding increase of 0.59 points on the Personal Accomplishment scale. Additionally, for every unit increase on the Social Resources scale there is, on average, a corresponding 0.31 unit increase on the Personal Accomplishment scale. As with Depersonalisation, it was found that although the magnitude of these effects is small, the variables are highly statistically significant as predictors. These results indicate that Cognitive Resources and Social Resources are predictors of increased Personal Accomplishment and may serve as buffers against burnout.

The preliminary modelling indicated that both Cognitive and Social Resources are significant predictors of Personal Accomplishment. However, the final regression analysis, which included the additional cases, resulted in Social Resources dropping out of the model. The results are provided in Table 12.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cognitive Resources (CRI)</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>7.176</td>
<td>&lt;0.00005</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 31.3\%$  
Adjusted $R^2 = 0.307$
Table 12 indicates that Social Resources drops out of the model when the number of cases in the data set increases due to elimination of other variables and missing data cases. However, it is not surprising that only one of these variables was included in the final model given that the correlation between Cognitive Resources and Social Resources was 0.67 ($p<0.01$).

In the final model, Cognitive Resources became the only predictive variable of Personal Accomplishment, accounting for 31.3% of the variance for the total sample. The reduced significance of Social Resources as a predictive variable for Personal Accomplishment will need further research and investigation. The positive relationship between Cognitive Resources and Personal Accomplishment again demonstrates its protective effect against burnout and supports the theoretical position that a positive attitude towards oneself and others increases an individual’s sense of competence. This final model negates the majority of associations proposed in Hypothesis 3, only supporting the proposition that low cognitive resources would be predictive of a low sense of personal accomplishment.

3.7.4 Hypothesis 4: Sex Differences and Burnout

Sex of the respondent in relation to burnout was not found to be significant when examined by multivariate and univariate tests. One-way MANOVA results, with Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment as the independent variables and sex as the dependent variable, were not significant ($F = 1.35; df = 3, 113; p=0.261$). These results suggest that neither sex is more likely to experience burnout than the other.

This finding in relation to sex of the respondent and burnout differs from the earlier significant results in relation to Depersonalisation. The fact that sex was
a significant predictor of Depersonalisation in the earlier stepwise multiple regression analysis (Table 10), as compared to these results, indicates that it may be more useful to examine sex in the context of other variables rather than on its own. The preliminary regression analyses however, with all three facets of burnout as the dependent variables, did take other variables (demographic factors, WES and CRI subscales) into account. However, when these variables were included in the analyses, sex was only found to be a significant predictor of Depersonalisation and not of Emotional Exhaustion or Personal Accomplishment. These results indicate that, overall, sex is not a highly significant predictor of burnout and that it is only when other variables are included in the analysis that it becomes a significant predictor of depersonalisation.

3.7.5 **Hypothesis 5: Women and Social Support**

In order to test the hypothesis that women were more likely to use social support as a buffer against Emotional Exhaustion, a one-way MANOVA was performed with Emotional Exhaustion as the dependent variable, sex as a two level factor and social resources as the covariate. Results are reported in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>-0.786</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5.201</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex By Social</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These results indicate that Social Resources are significantly linked to levels of Emotional Exhaustion, although neither sex was shown to have a greater link than the other. The interaction effect was not significant, indicating that the effects of social support are similar for both males and females and it is a negative relationship in each case. This was found to be significant on the univariate testing. Thus, for both groups, the overall testing indicated that lower Social Resources were reflective of higher levels of Emotional Exhaustion.

3.7.6 **Hypothesis 6: Supervisor Support and Burnout**

The correlations between Supervisor Support and all three measures of the burnout subscales were examined (Table 7). While none were significant (Emotional Exhaustion=-0.113, Depersonalisation=-0.036, Personal Accomplishment=0.080), Supervisor Support was a marginally significant predictor of Emotional Exhaustion when other factors were taken into account (see earlier stepwise regression results pertaining to Hypothesis 1). These contradictory results are an example of statistical confounding. This contradiction indicates a need for further investigation as to the possibility of confounding or interaction involving Supervisor Support in order to determine the value of this variable as a predictor of Emotional Exhaustion.

3.7.7 **Hypothesis 7: Age and Burnout**

Age was recoded into four age groups (20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years, 50-64 years). A one-way MANOVA was performed with the three burnout subscales as the independent variables and age as the dependent variable. The results were not significant (Wilks Lambda = 0.887; Approx. $F = 1.52; df = 9, 270; p=0.141$).
However, the multiple regression analysis (Hypothesis 2) with Depersonalisation as the dependent variable, indicated that age, when combined with other variables, was a significant predictor of Depersonalisation (Table 10). This relationship was negative, indicating that younger people are more likely to be depersonalised than older people. The ANOVA results from the one-way MANOVA (Hypothesis 7) confirmed that age is a significant predictor of Depersonalisation ($p=0.014$). A contrast comparing the first three age groups (ie: under 50 years) with the last age group (50-64 years) showed that there was a significant difference between the groups, with the older age group having lower Depersonalisation scores than the younger group ($F_{\text{obtained}}=10.07$, Scheffe $F_{\text{crit}}=8.1$). These results indicate that older staff members (50+ years) are less likely to experience depersonalisation towards their clients than younger staff members.

3.7.8 Hypothesis 8: Experience and Burnout

Length of employment was dichotomised into respondents who had been employed for 5 years or less and those who had been employed for 6 years or more. A One-way MANOVA was conducted, with experience of the respondent (as defined by length of employment in the child protection area) as the dependent variable and the three burnout subscales as the independent variables. Results were not significant ($F = 0.470$; $df = 3, 113$; $p=0.704$). These results indicate that the individual's length of employment in the child protection field was not predictive of their likelihood of experiencing burnout.

3.7.9 Hypothesis 9: Education and Burnout

Level of education attained by the respondent was dichotomised into those respondents who had completed a university degree or higher and those who
had not. A one-way MANOVA was then performed, with the level of education attained as the dependent variable and the three burnout subscales as the independent variables. No significant relationship was found between education and burnout (Wilks Lambda = 0.900; Approx. $F = 1.30; df = 9, 263; p=0.239$). This indicates that the level of education attained does not serve as a protective measure against burnout.

3.7.10 Hypothesis 10: Marital Status and Burnout

Marital Status was recoded into two groups (single versus partnered). Single people comprised those respondents who had labelled themselves as either single, widowed or divorced. Married people were those who had labelled themselves as either married or in a de facto relationship. A one-way MANOVA was then performed, with the two groups as the dependent variable and the three burnout subscales as the independent variables. No significant relationship was found between marital status and burnout ($F = 1.09; df = 3, 109; p=0.358$). This indicates that the support of a partner does not help ameliorate the effects of burnout.

3.7.11 Hypothesis 11: Children and Burnout

Respondents were grouped into those who had children and those who did not. A one-way MANOVA was then performed, with the two groups as the dependent variable and the three burnout subscales as the independent variables. No significant relationship was found between the number of children that respondents had (0 or >1) and burnout ($F = 0.46; df = 3, 112; p=0.708$). This indicates that children do not have a buffering effect on the experience of burnout.
CHAPTER 4

Discussion

4.1 Staff Turnover

One of the most striking results of the present study was the length of time that staff had spent in their current position. The majority of staff (90.8%) had been employed in their current position for 10 years or less, with 71.1% of these having been in their position for 1-5 years and the remaining 19.4% (nearly one fifth of the workforce) having been employed for less than a year. Although a certain percentage of these figures will be due to promotions and staff transferring within the organisation, it would seem that the rate of staff turnover is as high, if not higher, than it was when the Department compiled its original statistics in 1990. Then, the average length of stay for a new District Officer was 11 months. This again validates the necessity for intervention if these numbers are to be reduced.

4.2 Emotional Exhaustion

The overall mean for emotional exhaustion for the sample ($M=27.48$, $SD=10.43$), was higher than that reported by Maslach and Jackson for their social services sample ($M=21.35$, $SD=10.51$). They reported that a mean of over 27 should be classified as high, indicating that this sample could be seen as being highly emotionally exhausted. When broken down into percentages, over half (52.5%) of the sample scored in the high emotional exhaustion range, and a further 32.5% scored in the moderate emotional exhaustion range. Only
15% of the sample scored in the low range for emotional exhaustion. These findings are consistent with those of LeCroy and Rank (1986) who found that child abuse workers had the highest mean on the Emotional Exhaustion index than any other human service professions surveyed. They also found that child abuse workers scored considerably higher on Emotional Exhaustion than on the other two factors of burnout, but that they still had higher concentrations of Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment than other professions.

The current research also replicates that of Jackson et al. (1986). They found that many professionals who defined themselves as being burnt out actually remained in their job, despite their preferences to leave the job and/or the profession. This is similar to the current finding where a high percentage of people are experiencing emotional exhaustion, the most significant aspect of burnout, but are still working.

The first hypothesis was partially supported by the results of both the stepwise multiple regression analysis and the Pearson's Correlation. The first hypothesis suggested that high emotional exhaustion would be predicted by high work pressure, low levels of involvement, supervisor support, autonomy, clarity and control on the WES, and low levels of social, cognitive and emotional resources as determined by the CRI. The current results indicated that of these, low cognitive resources, low involvement in the workplace, high work pressure and high supervisor support were significant independent contributors to emotional exhaustion.

These results partially replicated the work of Robinson et al. (1991) who found that emotional exhaustion could be predicted on the WES by high work pressure, low involvement and low supervisor support. As noted in the
previous chapter, the predictive value of supervisor support was unstable and therefore caution should be taken in drawing conclusions in relation to this variable. This will be discussed further in Hypothesis 6 (regarding Supervisor Support and Burnout). These results do not support Oktay’s (1992) findings that belonging to a support group, age and autonomy were the best predictors of both emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation.

4.3 Depersonalisation

The second hypothesis, that high levels of depersonalisation would be predicted by high scores on the task orientation and work pressure subscales, and low scores on the autonomy, involvement and supervisor support subscales, as well as low levels of emotional, social and cognitive resources, was partially supported. The means and standard deviations for the sample (M=8.35, SD=5.48) were slightly higher than those reported by Maslach and Jackson (M=7.46, SD=5.11). They reported that means from 7 - 12 were within the moderate range for depersonalisation, indicating that this sample was moderately depersonalised.

The results of the stepwise regression analysis indicated that being younger, male, having low cognitive resources, low task orientation and high innovation, were significant independent predictors of depersonalisation. These results are again similar to Robinson et al. (1991), but do not totally support their findings. Leiter (1988) suggested that poor supervisor support and peer relations were significant contributors to depersonalisation, however, his findings were not supported by this research. These results do confirm the findings of Pines et al. (1981) who noted that men are more likely to be depersonalised than women.
4.4 Personal Accomplishment

Results of the third stepwise regression analysis only partially supported the third hypothesis, that high personal accomplishment would be predicted by high work pressure, high involvement, high autonomy, high supervisor support and high clarity on the WES, and high physical, cognitive, social and emotional resources on the CRI. Means and standard deviations for the sample ($M=32.18$, $SD=7.24$) were commensurate with those reported by Maslach and Jackson ($M=32.75$, $SD=7.71$). They have reported that means from 32 - 38 can be classified as moderate, indicating that this sample was moderate in their experience of personal accomplishment.

Results of the multiple regression analysis indicated that high cognitive and social resources were the only significant independent contributors towards personal accomplishment with no environmental factors contributing at a significant level. With the increase in number of cases in the data set, however, Social Resources was eliminated and Cognitive Resources became the only predictive variable of Personal Accomplishment. This was not surprising given the high correlation between the two variables. These results contrasted with the findings of Savicki and Cooley (1987), who reported that in their research personal accomplishment was most clearly related to peer support. Despite the correlation between Cognitive and Social Resources, it was decided to retain Social Resources in the model for Study 2. This was due to the wealth of literature about the role of social support as an ameliorator of burnout.

The current results indicate that previous research which has focussed on the working environment for providing predictors of personal accomplishment (Robinson et al., 1991; Leiter, 1991b; and Brown, 1986), has neglected personal
resources which, when combined with environmental factors in this study, have been found to be more significant.

It would appear from these results that it is the positive attitude and view of the world that the individual employee brings to the workplace that is the most significant predictor of their level of Personal Accomplishment, rather than their experience of the work environment itself. Of interest would be whether this is therefore an innate quality which employees initially bring with them to the workplace. Conversely, it may be an adaptive skill that employees create within themselves over time as a function of the paucity of positive reinforcement and useful feedback within their working environment.

4.5 Cognitive Resources

Cognitive resources were associated with all three subscales of the Burnout measure and accounted for the majority of the variance for both Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment. This indicates the importance of the essential positive attitude and resourcefulness of the individual over the working environment factors. Staff who were identified as having low levels of cognitive resources were found to be more emotionally exhausted, more depersonalised, and as having lower levels of personal accomplishment than staff with high levels of cognitive resources. The overall mean and standard deviation of the sample \((M=27.65, SD=4.77)\) was commensurate with that of Hammer and Marting (1988) for an adult population \((M=28.09, SD=4.27)\), indicating that this sample was no more depleted in their cognitive resources than an average adult population.
These results replicate the findings of Jupp and Shaul (1991). They found when assessing the effects of work stress and sources of support on burnout in student counsellors, that negative appraisals of work environments and negative attitudes expressed about peers and clients were significantly associated with self-assessments of burnout.

It should be noted however, that the sample for this study was highly educated, with 49.6% having completed tertiary studies. Tertiary studies are currently an essential criterion to employment as a Child Protection worker with the Department of Community Services, as they are for most human service agencies. It is possible that the significant contribution of cognitive resources towards the variance of all three of the burnout subscales may be a function of the educated nature of the sample, rather than a true indication of its predictive potential in a general population. An alternate view would be that Cognitive Resources may be the best single predictor of burnout for this sample as this is the internal resource required in order to stay within the Department of Community Services, regardless of the working environment that the department provides.

4.6 Supervisor Support and Burnout

Given the wealth of literature regarding the supervisor's role in relation to burnout, it was surprising that the correlation between supervisor support and the three burnout measures was not significant. It is also interesting that, while supervisor support was found to be a significant predictor of emotional exhaustion in the multiple regression analysis, it was a positive relationship, suggesting that high rather than low supervisor support was a predictor of emotional exhaustion. Although it only accounted for 2% of the variance, the
direction of this finding was contrary to the bulk of research. Hence Hypothesis 6, that low supervisor support would be predictive of high burnout on all three measures was not supported.

The contrast between the non significant correlation (of supervisor support and emotional exhaustion) and the inclusion of high supervisor support as a significant predictor of emotional exhaustion, is an example of statistical confounding. This illustrates the need for further investigation into the role of supervisor support as a predictive variable in relation to burnout. Nonetheless, the positive relationship between Work Pressure and Supervisor Support with Emotional Exhaustion on the Stepwise Regression, compared to the negative relationship between Cognitive Resources and Involvement with Emotional Exhaustion is interesting. The results suggest that a work environment that is highly pressured, but which has high supervisor support, is more likely to induce burnout than one where the individual is involved with others, but also has a positive attitude and internal feelings of competency.

Of interest, is that while these results do not support the majority of previous research (Jackson et al., 1986; Russell et al., 1987; Seltzer & Numerof, 1988; Davis et al., 1989; Ross et al., 1989; Miller et al., 1990; Razza, 1993; Maslach & Leiter, 1997), they do support the theoretical stance of Huebner (1993) and Razza (1993). These researchers have noted that the supervisor is able to be either a major source of stress, or a significant figure in the prevention and management of burnout. Thus, supervisors could be perceived as either a source of, or relief from stress and strain. It is important to note that these results suggest that for this sample, supervisors were generally perceived as a being a source of stress.
The small effects of supervisor support in these findings also reflect the work of Palsson, Hallberg, Norberg and Bjoervell (1996). In their study of 33 district nurses they found that there were no significant effects of clinical supervision on burnout, empathy and a sense of coherence within or between their two research groups. They too recommended further investigation into the effects of clinical supervision.

While this study suggests that supervisor support cannot predict burnout, it does not necessarily refute Cherniss's (1980, 1988) proposition that the supervisor may be a key factor in the amelioration of burnout. It may be that while a supervisor may not contribute to the burnout process, they may still be vital to its amelioration, as has also been proposed by others (Huebner, 1993; Razza, 1993). Essentially, it remains difficult to determine whether the support of supervisors is not a significant predictor of burnout, or whether the effect of supervisor support was confounded by the difficulty of surveying seventeen different work environments (with up to two different supervisors in each environment). This may have had the effect of "watering down" the possible contribution of supervisor support as a variable. It is also possible that staff may have experienced their supervisor as giving a high level of support or monitoring, but that the quality of supervision was very low. Due to the difficulties in interpreting these results, and the wealth of opposing literature, it was decided that Supervisor Support should be kept in the model for Study 2 to allow further investigation into its value as a predictor of burnout.

4.7 Demographic Factors and Burnout

Sex, age, experience, education, marital status and having children were all examined in relation to burnout. No significant difference was found for sex,
level of education attained, level of experience, marital status or between those who did and did not have children for this sample. A small relationship was found between certain age groups and depersonalisation.

Examination of sex differences in terms of respondents' experience of burnout, did not indicate any significant differences (negating Hypothesis 4). This is consistent with the proposition by Leiter et al. (1994), who argue that findings in relation to gender differences have been weak and unreliable. They, like Maslach and Jackson (1985), suggest that inconsistencies in findings on gender and burnout may be a function of the different occupational roles of men and women.

The MANOVA results on the effects of sex of the respondent on social resources were not significant. This negated Hypothesis 5, and refuted Hetherington et al.'s (1989) suggestion that women will experience greater emotional exhaustion than men because they face more demands in terms of the conflict between traditional and modern roles of home and work. These results also refute Himle et al.'s (1986) findings that decreased emotional support from supervisors and co-workers is predictive of irritation, emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation in women. This was in contrast to increased amounts of client contact and role ambiguity, which was causational of burnout in men. They also contradict similar research by Pines et al. (1981) and Greenglass and Burke (1988). They noted that women utilise and have a greater need for social support than men. These results demonstrate that there was no significant interaction between Social Resources and gender in terms of its effect on Emotional Exhaustion. Therefore, there is no differential protection for men and women based on their Social Resources.
Age of the respondent was not significant for three out of the four age groups in relation to the prediction of burnout. A small difference was found for the fourth age group of 50-65 year old respondents (approximately 5% of the sample), who tended to be less depersonalised than the younger groups. This partially supports Hypothesis 7, that older people would experience lower levels of burnout. The results support the research of Huberty and Huebner (1988) and Rosenthal et al. (1989), who suggested that as professionals become older and experience more life situations, they develop a variety of behavioural and attitudinal patterns that reduce the likelihood of burnout. The current results only partially support the research of Maslach & Jackson (1981), and Robinson et al. (1991), who found that age was significantly correlated with a greater sense of personal accomplishment and less emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation.

Experience in the child protection field was not significant in predicting burnout. This negated Hypothesis 8 and contradicted the research of Carney et al. (1993), and Maslach and Jackson (1981) who proposed that experienced practitioners will have developed effective coping mechanisms over time. It also negated other researchers’ findings (Fryer et al., 1988; Rodolfa et al., 1988; Himle & Jayaratne, 1990; Langemo, 1998) that professional staff with more experience are less at risk than those who are trainees or new graduates. The results also opposed Cherniss (1980) and Leiter’s (1991b) theoretical propositions that new graduates or trainees are more at risk of burnout due to the conflict between their initial ideals and expectations, as compared to the realities of a bureaucratic workplace.

No significant difference was found for higher levels of education attained in relation to burnout as proposed in Hypothesis 9. While there were no significant differences for any of the educational groups, results of the
MANOVA indicated that level of education approached significance ($p=0.056$) for some Post Graduate groups in relation to Personal Accomplishment. This suggests that, despite the results not being at a significant level, further training or tertiary studies may assist workers in protecting them from burnout. This lends some support to the research by Manlove (1993) that those with more education, training and work experience reported higher levels of Personal Accomplishment.

Additionally, being single and not having children were not found to be significant predictors of burnout (Hypotheses 10 and 11). This refutes the research of Hetherington et al. (1989), McMullen and Krantz (1988), and Maslach and Jackson (1985) who found that the typical burnout candidates were young, white, single people in the early stage of their work experience.

4.8 Theoretical Implications

A strength of this study is that it examined both personal resources and environmental resources in relation to burnout, rather than one or the other. This study also had particular relevance for the District Officers. Indeed, a number of them commented that it was rewarding to complete a questionnaire that examined themselves, rather than just their work. This interest may well be reflected in the high response rate for an organisational survey (62.2%).

The current research results supported the proposed conceptual model, which postulated that it is the interaction of personal and environmental factors that determines whether an individual burns out or not. The results of this study indicate that cognitive resources of the individual are the most important single contributor to Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment, and are
significant in the prediction of Emotional Exhaustion. However, the work environment factors of involvement, task orientation, work pressure and innovation were also shown to have an impact upon staff. The values of supervisor support and social support as predictors of burnout were demonstrated to be questionable in the current research. Due to their theoretical value they will be included in Study 2 with a view to gaining more information about their utility.

Some of the other theoretical implications from Study 1 can be summarised as follows:

a) Sex differences in relation to burnout were only significant for Depersonalisation, rather than for Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment, and only when other variables (Cognitive Resources, Age, Task Orientation and Innovation) were taken into account. Future research should concentrate on the interplay between these variables, rather than looking for the interaction between gender and burnout alone.

b) The finding that older people were less likely to experience Depersonalisation suggests that older people are more empathic than younger people, perhaps due to their broader experience. This should be explored further in future research.

c) Length of time employed as a District Officer, level of education attained, marital status and whether or not respondents had children, were not found to be related to the burnout process. Future research should not include these variables.

These results serve to clarify which of the variables proposed in the literature are of relevance for Child Protection workers in the Department of Community Services. The results confirm the proposition that it is the interplay between
the individual's resources and the working environment that determines whether or not an individual is likely to burn out.

Seven variables were shown to be predictive of burnout (Involvement, Supervisor Support, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Innovation, Social Resources and Cognitive Resources). Of these, Cognitive Resources was shown to be the best single predictor of burnout. A visual representation of the significant independent predictors of burnout is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Shows that the significant predictors of the three areas of burnout were cognitive resources, social resources, involvement, work pressure, supervisor support, task orientation and innovation.
4.9 **Usefulness of the Adapted Form of the WES as a Measure**

Overall, the measures had satisfactory reliability and validity, although it was difficult to determine the true reliability of the revised short form of the WES as it was assessing seventeen different work environments. Given that the Cronbach's Alpha for the 40 items for the WES was low in this study, it is suggested that further research should be directed towards carrying out psychometric testing and analysis on a homogeneous work environment sample.

4.10 **Limitations of the Study**

There are a number of limitations to this study. The primary limitation involved the departmental constraints on sampling, in that only District Officers from the Metropolitan North Division were able to be surveyed. Although this covered a large variety of areas, the country regions were not able to be included in the current study.

Secondly, the number of worksites (seventeen) covered may mean that the statistical properties of the WES were compromised, as participants were basing their responses on different environmental stimuli. In order to have minimised this effect and to have increased the alpha rates, it may have been better to have carried out a pilot study using the full Work Environment Scale, and then to have selected the best items from the scale for inclusion in the final questionnaire.

A third limitation is that the MBI is a state measure, rather than a trait one. As the measure was only given once, it is possible that it measured a transitional
mood state. It is proposed that this issue will be addressed in Study 2 through the utilisation of pre and post test measures.

Fourthly, specialty areas such as District Officers for Aboriginal people, Disability, Adolescent Support, Multi-cultural etc. were not accounted for in the survey. During the study it became apparent that these areas have both similar and different stressors to the Generalist District Officers, involving issues such as management knowledge and support of their specialty area.

A fifth limitation is that it would have been useful to test the final theoretical model with the seven predictors of burnout that were identified in this study. This was not possible however as there were too many variables for too few subjects. Future studies may be able to conduct this form of testing if the Department of Community Services were to allow more District Officers to participate in the research.

Suggested further research would be to longitudinally survey those coming into the department and those currently employed, in relation to their inherent personal resources and their likelihood of experiencing burnout. This could then be combined with interviews of those who subsequently leave the department to determine the reasons involved. Additional research should also address the need for intervention in the burnout process for District Officers of the Department. This would be in order to try and maintain the existing staff and to avoid the huge social, personal and financial costs that have been associated with burnout. These have been detailed in the preceding chapters. It is this second proposition that will become the focus of Study 2.
4.11 Conclusion

The results of the present study generally support the conceptual model of an interactive process of burnout, which incorporates both an individual's personal coping resources and the many facets of their working environment. While this sample was shown to score within the moderate range compared to Maslach and Jackson's (1986) normative data for the social services on the Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment scales, they were found to be highly Emotionally Exhausted when compared to their sample. While the current sample does not fit the "classic" burnout profile of high emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation and low personal accomplishment scores (Maslach, 1982), the current findings do support the research of LeCroy and Rank (1986) in relation to consistently high Emotional Exhaustion scores in child abuse workers. As emotional exhaustion has been proposed to be the greatest contributor to the burnout process (Maslach, 1978, 1982, 1986), these findings should not be underestimated. This level of overall emotional exhaustion may well account for the high turnover in child protection staff in the Department of Community Services.

Cognitive Resources was the most significant independent contributor to the prediction of Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment and the second most significant for Emotional Exhaustion. Accordingly, more research should be focussed on this variable and its relationship to the burnout process. Work environment factors were also seen to be important in contributing to emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation. If the current staff turnover is to be ameliorated, then staff development should address issues such as the development of positive cognitive resources, management/supervisor support for workers, and positive ways of dealing with work pressure and workload.
The basis of this continuing research is therefore derived from the current study. Study 2 is aimed at devising an intervention based on the significant predictors of burnout that have been highlighted in the present research. This will hopefully assist in arresting and ameliorating the burnout process for professional Child Protection workers.
CHAPTER 5

STUDY 2

5.1 Study 2

The aim of Study 2 was to refine and extend the research findings of Study 1 and to devise an intervention strategy aimed at ameliorating the rate of current staff turnover. Refinements include incorporating new hypotheses in relation to some of the questionable variables of Study 1 (Supervisor Support and Social Resources). Extensions of the research will include creating an intervention that will assist in preventing burnout, followed by an evaluation of its efficacy.

It was decided that a workshop would be the best means of assisting with both burnout prevention and reparation. A workshop was chosen as the means of intervention as it would be a discrete, time-limited intervention that fitted within the framework of the Department of Community Services, and would be a familiar forum for District Officers that would hopefully encourage attendance. This workshop was to be based upon the seven identified predictors of burnout found in Study 1 (Involvement, Supervisor Support, Work Pressure, Task Orientation, Innovation, Cognitive Resources and Social Resources).

In devising the intervention it was decided to base it around a cognitive framework as Cognitive Resources was the only common significant predictor identified across the three burnout measures in Study 1. Given the significance of the contribution of cognitive resources to the burnout model, a new theoretical construct, Seligman's Learned Helplessness Theory (1975), was also
examined in relation to burnout. Potter (1987) suggests that Learned Helplessness is a typical response to the burnout phenomenon. She proposes that when individuals feel worthless and inadequate in their employment, they initially try and make changes, but if these are ineffective they struggle and then give up. She states that in this way individuals become burnt out without resorting to more effective means to manage their job dissatisfaction. Over time, individuals may feel burnt out, but stay in the job due to other reasons (financial necessity, lack of other career prospects etc.), leaving them with high feelings of Learned Helplessness. It was thus decided to incorporate the Learned Helplessness construct into the research.

5.2 Learned Helplessness

Seligman postulated his initial Learned Helplessness Theory in 1975. This predicted that uncontrollable failure in an organism would generally be followed by a lowered response initiation. In supporting his theory, he detailed the now famous study of a dog being shocked in a box without an escape route who, even when later presented with an escape, refused to use it. He defined this sense of overwhelming helplessness and despair as Learned Helplessness, which he saw as a form of depression.

Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale introduced the reformulated learned helplessness model in 1978. This specified the type of individuals who were more vulnerable and those who were more resistant when failure was encountered. The reformulated learned helplessness model (Abramson et al., 1978) postulates that depression is the result of experience with uncontrollable aversive events. However, they believe that the nature of the depression following these events is governed by the causal attributions that the
individual makes for them. These attributions are seen as being either internal or external.

Internal attributions are defined by Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky and Seligman (1982) as a perception by the individual that the aversive events were caused by something about themselves. External attributions are made when the individual perceives that it was something about the situation itself that caused the uncontrollable negative event.

In addition, if the uncontrollable events are attributed to nontransient factors (stable attributions) in contrast to transient ones (unstable attributions), then the depressive symptoms are expected to be long-lasting. If the events are attributed to causes present in a variety of situations (global attributions) as compared to more specific causes (specific attributions) then the subsequent depression is thought to be pervasive. Peterson et al. (1982) note that the reformulated model proposes that attributing uncontrollable, bad events to internal, stable and global factors leads to depression. They suggest that each individual therefore has an attributional style which is based on their characteristic attributional tendencies.

McMullen & Krantz (1988) clarify the theory by describing the learned helpless individual as being characterised by stable patterns of attribution with respect to experiences of success and failure. They state that this individual feels personally responsible for failures, conceiving of failure as a pervasive quality of personal experience. This individual also conceives of success as fortuitous and does not take responsibility when it occurs.

Seligman and Schulman (1986) theorised that individuals who habitually construe the causes of bad events as internal, stable and global should be more
susceptible to helplessness deficits than those with the opposite style. They state that these individuals will blame themselves and expect failure to recur over a longer period of time and in more situations, consequently suffering from more self-esteem deficits.

In their 1986 research, Seligman and Schulman hypothesised that the tendency to explain bad events by internal, stable and global causes, would potentiate quitting when undesirable events were encountered. In their two studies of 94 and 103 experienced life insurance sales agents, they found that a pessimistic explanatory style led to poor productivity and quitting when bad events were experienced. Significant results that emerged from the study included the finding that those who had an optimistic explanatory style survived in their position at a significantly higher rate than those with a more pessimistic explanatory style. Secondly, those with an optimistic style sold more insurance than those with a pessimistic style. It was also found that explanatory style predicted survival and productivity. This supports the theoretical stance that a negative explanatory style predisposes to poor performance and is then triggered by failure in those individuals with the predisposing style. The interaction of the two components increases the likelihood of helplessness deficits.

Seligman and Schulman concluded that one practical implication of their research findings lay in the possibility of early identification of individuals who were particularly suitable or unsuitable for work that entailed frequent failure or rejection. They stated that matching the right explanatory style of the individual to the work requirements would be useful to the individual and the organisation in terms of personnel selection, as it would steer vulnerable individuals away from positions that were characteristically fraught with adversity. They also suggested that engaging existing staff in adversity or
remedial attributional training may be helpful given the correlation they found between explanatory style and job performance.

Singhal and Kanungo (1994) in their review observed that a large percent of empirical research is confined to the laboratory settings with resulting problems in operationalisation, measurement, range of variables, replication of findings and utility of findings for improving practices. More recent research however, such as that by Portman (1995), Chan (1996), Miserandino (1998) and Schill and Marcus (1998), has taken learned helplessness theory into more utilitarian settings such as schools and other organisations in order to determine its relevance for human beings, as opposed to animals.

Portman (1995) conducted a study of low skilled 6th grade students in physical education classes from 3 school districts. In addition to low skill, thirteen of the children were identified as exhibiting symptoms of learned helplessness and had a belief that success was unattainable. Their experience was that physical education was humiliating, frustrating, embarrassing and barely tolerable. She found that as a result of their beliefs, they were then unwilling to expend effort to learn skills, and were therefore unable to improve. Data from the study showed that in general, the low skilled students did not get enough practise time to learn many of the basic skills, could not execute what they learned in games and had little or no success across different activity units.

Chan (1996) examined the effects of combined strategy and attributional training through small group intervention in a specific reading task. Forty poor, and 56 average readers were randomly divided into four instruction condition groups involving different combinations of strategy instruction and attributional training. Her results indicated that teaching poor readers
effective reading strategies, while convincing them that reading successes and failures were attributable to use of effective or ineffective strategies, not only improved their comprehension performance and increased the use of the reading strategies, but also reduced their perceptions of learned helplessness.

In her study of 11 high school boys on a university basketball team, Miserandino (1998) split the team into an experimental and a control group. She conducted a 4 week training period, where half the subjects received feedback about their shooting technique and were encouraged to attribute any performance deficits to lack of effort, rather than to lack of ability. The remaining team members, as the control group, only received feedback on their shooting technique. At the end of the period she found that subjects in the attributional retraining group showed more mastery-oriented attributions and greater improvement in their shooting than did the control group.

Schill & Marcus (1998) conducted a study of 30 recently incarcerated male inmates and 30 male inmates, who had been incarcerated for at least 5 years. They found that those who had been incarcerated for at least 5 years reported a more internal, stable and global attributional style for negative events than did the recently incarcerated inmates, even when controlling for age and length of sentence. They, like Seligman (1975), suggest that prolonged exposure to an uncontrollable situation may have an influence on attributional style.

5.3 Learned Helplessness and Burnout

While some recent studies have examined learned helplessness in child abuse victims (Cerezo & Frias, 1994; Shapiro, 1995), no literature was found on learned helplessness in child protection workers, and very little on the
relationship between learned helplessness and burnout. Despite this, Potter (1987) proposes that Learned Helplessness is an inevitable response when individuals perceive themselves as being out of control and powerless in a work setting. As such, she has theorised that it is clearly linked to the burnout process.

In a study of 128 female child care workers, McMullen & Krantz (1988) found that their results generally supported the hypothesised relationships between burnout, learned helplessness and self-esteem. They noted that if the assumption was made that attributional style and self-esteem were relatively stable aspects of a caregiver's personality, then one could conclude that learned helplessness and low self-esteem predisposed certain caregivers to burnout. Their results indicated that caregivers who experienced emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation tended towards lower self-esteem and increased learned helplessness. They found, however, that a sense of helplessness and low self-esteem may have resulted from, rather than caused, the experience of burnout which they believed exemplified the pervasive effects of burnout on caregiver functioning. Also of interest was their finding that burnout did not include a reduced sense of Personal Accomplishment in their population. This was similar to the findings of Study 1 in the current research.

Collins (1995) examined the environmental stresses that affect social work lecturers, and possible connections to trends of illness, lengthy absence from work and early retirement. Results indicated that many lecturers felt a diminishing sense of control over the parameters of their work, and that this was linked to learned helplessness and burnout. He concluded that amongst other intervention solutions, support from management and good communication were essential in maintaining good morale in lecturers.
Latting and Blanchard (1997) noted that members of social work organisations often promote poverty as a virtue, implicitly expecting that truly dedicated workers should be employed for less than market wages and should have to endure shabby office facilities and inadequate resources. They theorised that this expectation may lead to learned helplessness among workers. Consequently, they developed an organisational intervention that encouraged staff empowerment and visionary goal setting. The positive results of the intervention both supported the leadership’s promotion of responsible business and service goals, as well as promoted positive feedback from clients.

5.4 Learned Helplessness and Coping

Folkman & Lazarus (1980) have identified controllability perceptions as critical influences in the stress and coping process. Situations perceived as offering little opportunity for change are linked to coping strategies that are emotion focused, whereas situations that are perceived as allowing for change are more likely to be linked to problem oriented approaches. They suggest that adopting a more multidimensional approach that includes an analysis of controllability may be helpful in predicting coping responses to stressors.

Folkman et al. (1986) propose that the growing research on coping is indicative of a perception that coping is a major factor in the relation between stressful events and adaptational outcomes such as depression, psychological symptoms and somatic illness. They state that this research has recently focussed on actual coping processes that people use to manage the demands of stressful events, as distinct from trait-oriented research, which focuses on personality dispositions.
They believe that the critical difference between the trait-oriented and the process-oriented approaches is the significance given to the psychological and environmental context in which coping takes place. In the trait-oriented approach, it is assumed that coping is primarily a property of the person and variations in the stressful situation are of little importance. In contrast, the context is critical in the process-oriented approach because coping is assessed as a response to the psychological and environmental demands of specific stressful encounters.

Folkman et al. (1986) extended this theory with research findings that suggested that the pattern of coping in situations that subjects appraised as having to be accepted was strikingly different from the pattern in situations that they appraised as being changeable. In changeable encounters, subjects used coping strategies that kept them focused on the situation through being confronting and using planned problem-solving techniques. They tended to accept responsibility and selectively attended to positive aspects of the encounter. This was in contrast to when subjects appraised the situation as having to be accepted, where they tended to distance themselves and employ escape-avoidance techniques, which prevented focus on the troubling situation.

Kyriacou (1987) cites literature that has looked at coping in relation to stress and burnout. He states that there are two main strategies that contribute to the coping process. The first involves direct action and positively dealing with the source of stress, while the second is to use palliative techniques which essentially accept the source of stress but attempt to mitigate the emotional experience of stress which follows. He notes that while palliative techniques can be effective, if the source of stress remains present then some stress will inevitably be experienced.
In surveying mental health workers, Leiter (1990) found that those who responded to problems at work with control-oriented strategies were less likely to experience burnout. Those who attempted to address difficult situations with the use of escape-type strategies tended to be more burned out. He reported that a longitudinal analysis indicated that control coping was relevant to the lowering of subsequent levels of burnout. It was hoped that the current Burnout Prevention Workshop would assist workers in developing control coping rather than escape-type strategies.

5.5 Work Environments and Organisational Caregiving

A review of the literature and the fact that five of the seven identified predictors of burnout were related to the individual’s work environment in Study 1, suggests that organisational caregiving is important in relation to work environment and burnout. It was seen as being a particularly important construct in relation to providing a working framework through which the Burnout Prevention Workshop participants could assess their working environments.

Jackson et al. (1986) have stated that there is an implicit expectation by human service professionals that human service organisations will have a humanistic management philosophy. They suggest that if this expectation is unmet, and the organisation treats employees in a dehumanised fashion, then employees may also become dehumanised in their response to their clients.

This supports Kahn’s (1993) argument that immediate supervisors represent the organisation to their subordinates and that when supervisors do not nurture their subordinates, the subordinates perceive the organisation as being
without nurture. Calabrese (1986) notes that the retention of quality candidates in any field is partly related to job satisfaction and working conditions. He states that an environment can be described as dehumanising when individuals are treated in a sub-human fashion and when they are not treated with the respect and trust normally associated with their level of expertise. He states that this type of treatment results in loss of self-esteem, lack of confidence, stress, burnout and alienation.

Lyth (1988) found that staff members of children's institutions were most effective when they experienced the same concern and support for their stresses as they were expected to provide for children and their families. Kahn (1993) notes that these findings suggest that social support from leaders and co-workers in the form of emotional support, consideration, resources and mentoring, allows organisation members to remain engaged in their jobs rather than being drained, automatic and disengaged.

Kahn (1993) identifies eight behavioural dimensions of caregiving that reflect the provision of emotional support, information, materials and appraisals to staff. These dimensions designate categories of behaviours that enable care-seekers to feel cared for and cared about. They are: accessibility, enquiry, attention, validation, empathy, support, compassion and consistency. He believes that a superior weaves these eight behavioural interactions together on a daily basis, both for caregiving and withholding care. His research found that when members felt cared for by superiors they were more willing and able to pass on such caregiving to their clients.

In one of his studies of organisational caregiving, Kahn (1993) found that there were five patterns that characterised either recurring acts of caregiving or withholding care in the agency that he was studying. Kahn proposed that each
of these patterns focuses on or reflects the influence of superior-subordinate hierarchical relationships, and believes that this perspective reflects how the dysfunctionality of a social system often derives from, and is maintained by, different dimensions simultaneously. He labelled them as:

a) **flow** - caregiving flowing from agency superiors to subordinates during role-related interactions;

b) *reverse flow* - reverse caregiving in hierarchical relationships, with agency subordinates giving unreciprocated care to superiors;

c) **fragmented** - a cycling of caregiving between a superior and subordinate who simultaneously replenish one another while withholding care from others for whom they are responsible;

d) **self-contained** - the temporary retreat of subsystem members into mutual caregiving that occurs outside the hierarchical structure;

e) **barren** - a mutual lack of caregiving between hierarchical superiors and subordinates.

It was thought that, by adopting Kahn's theoretical framework as part of the Burnout Prevention Workshop, participants would be able to help define how the system within their centre worked from an organisational caregiving perspective. It was hoped that the provision of this framework would then allow them to make choices about how they would function within the system, based upon their perception of the system's propensity to effect and allow change.

Miller et al. (1990) support the idea of people functioning in a particular way dependent upon their environmental context. They proposed that job attitudes can best be understood in terms of the informational and social environment within which behaviour occurs and to which it adapts. They cite literature that views perceptions of the workplace and job attitudes as a function of the
communication environment in which workers are embedded, rather than as a function of the objective characteristics of jobs and needs of employees.

Lancefield, Lennings & Thomson (1994) in a study of 112 prison officers, compared a bureaucratic and a unit management model of prison administration in relation to the levels of state-trait anxiety in the officers. They found that those officers who were working under the bureaucratic management model had higher anxiety levels than those who worked under the unit management model.

Hence, other research, combined with the results of Study 1, indicates the importance of work environment factors as a context for the experience of the worker. These theoretical issues highlight the importance of the interactive Person-Environment Fit conceptual model proposed in Study 1.

5.6 Devising An Intervention

In order to devise an appropriate intervention, each of the seven predictive variables of burnout identified in Study 1 (Involvement, Supervisor Support, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Innovation, Cognitive Resources and Social Resources) were included in the framework of the intervention. Kahn's (1993) theoretical framework was used as a basis to help staff gain an understanding of organisational caregiving and to determine the caregiving structure in which they worked. It was decided by the researcher that the most applicable method of responding to the burnout process would be through a training workshop. Additional training for employees through staff development structures has been encouraged within the literature (Burrows, 1989; Hetherington et al., 1989).
Burrows (1989) reinforces the need for training as an intervention, with comments from the burnout literature on the importance of providing training at any level:

"But most important is adequate training. When an agency is under-resourced, the first things to go are supervision and training. If you have no training, you are working from intuition, you're drawing from you the person, not from your skills, and you are not getting recharged. Training helps you provide workers with these skills and recharges them as well" (p. 10).

Following their study of 312 professional and paraprofessional nurses working in acute and long term health care facilities, Hare, Pratt and Andrews (1988) concluded that interventions should be aimed at focussing on organisational issues such as supervisor support and peer relationships, and upon assisting staff to use instrumental coping strategies. They suggested that this could best be done through staff training and work related counselling.

Lee and Ashforth (1993) noted that, given the progressive nature of burnout, planned interventions should be designed for the long haul and should deal with the root cause not just the symptoms. They suggested that possible interventions might include restructuring work units to allow for greater decision latitude and work autonomy, and less situational uncertainty. They also recommended developing emotional and instrumental support networks to assist in the handling of problematic situations. Overall, they thought that it was crucial that any intervention programmes should be monitored and be flexible enough to deal with unanticipated events. As such, they recommended that mechanisms for strategy evaluation, feedback and follow-up planning should be inherent in the intervention programme's inception and development.
By comparison, Slutsky (1981) evaluated three treatment methods for 60 child protection workers in relation to burnout. He compared an interactional burnout treatment programme, a didactic burnout treatment programme and a waiting list, and found that either of the treatment programmes compared to the control group was effective in significantly reducing burnout levels. Interestingly, no significant difference was noted between the types of treatment programmes offered.

Hyman (1993) evaluated the effects of three, three-hour sessions designed to address communication skills, self-esteem and stress management in 51 long term care staff. Using a retrospective pretest design, a statistically significant improvement between "then" and "today" was found for all three facets of burnout. Responses from open-ended questions about the effects of the workshop also corroborated the quantitative data.

Van Dierendonck, Schaufeli and Buunk (1998) evaluated a 5 week burnout intervention programme based on equity theory among direct care professionals working with mentally disabled individuals. Staff were split into one experimental and two control groups, with individual absenteeism rates being assessed for 1 year before and after the programme. Their results indicated that for the experimental group, burnout, absence and deprived feelings decreased compared to the control groups. Interestingly, the most profound effects were among participants who could draw on social resources to benefit from the intervention.

Jenkins and Calhoun (1991) found in their study of 124 female school teachers that individual stress management plans were more effective than group lecture style training. They reported that, compared to those who received a group lecture, more teachers trained in the individual approach noted that they
were doing something about work and home stressors. They found that those teachers trained in the individual approach practiced more diversity in stress management techniques in both the work and home environments and spent more time on management of stress than the other group. Potter (1987) also recommended the use of personalised goals. She states that in order to sustain motivation, an individual must see a cause and effect relationship between what they do and what happens to them. As such, she believes that the individual must be able to feel that they can influence what happens to them, either good or bad, through their own actions.

Based on his research, Huebner (1993) recommended that each school psychologist conduct their own assessment of self-perceived antecedents of stress, possibly in conjunction with their supervisor or an appropriate peer group. He suggested that each assessment would require a thorough analysis of the individual and interpersonal and organisational factors that may be functioning as stressors in a particular situation. Following this assessment, he recommended that the school psychologists would be advised to develop systematic, individualised stress management intervention plans to increase the likelihood of successful change or prevention. He notes: “as is true for all interventions, the development of carefully planned and monitored strategies is essential to the production and maintenance of change” (Huebner, 1993, p. 45).

The workshop was framed around each of the seven predictive variables of burnout. As cognitive resources was defined as the most salient of these variables, the workshop was structured as a cognitive approach, with some behavioural strategies also being implemented. Personal plans were built into the workshop process, as individual planning was identified within the
literature as being more useful than the setting of group goals (Baron & Cohen, 1982; Rosenthal et al., 1989; Jenkins & Calhoun, 1991; Huebner, 1993).

Various researchers have supported the idea of interventions that address a number of related issues at once (Miller et al., 1990; Melamed et al., 1991). Miller et al., (1990) found that increasing both participation in decision-making and support from the supervisor and co-workers served to reduce the perception of stressors in the work environment. These factors were found to be linked to a decrease in the workers' experience of burnout and to increase the experience of positive outcomes such as satisfaction and commitment. Melamed et al. (1991) suggested that, as they found perceived control and social support to be additive rather than interactive variables, they recommended it was preferable to launch intervention programmes aimed at improving the variables simultaneously, rather than addressing the issues separately.

As the predictive variables from Study 1 were to form the basis of the Burnout Prevention Workshop, a review of literature was conducted. This was to gain an understanding of the ways in which the identified variables had been successfully utilised in interventions relating to the prediction and amelioration of burnout.

5.6.1 Involvement

Involvement in the work environment is seen as being an important factor in the reduction of burnout. Insel and Moos (1974), Lee and Ashforth (1993) and Semler (1994) have stated that the likelihood of achieving an optimum environment is greatly facilitated when critical decisions about changing the
environment are in the hands of the people who function within the environment.

In terms of intervention, Jenkins and Calhoun (1991) suggested that the promotion of "quality circles" within a workplace, where the groups identify problems in their workplace and develop cost-effective solutions to them, provides an opportunity for direct modification of sources of stress. This is achieved through group problem solving and allows participants the chance for generating feelings of control and autonomy and mutual social support. Semler (1994) also supports these findings. His underlying managerial philosophy is that workers who are involved in active decision making and feel that they are part of an industry are more likely to work hard, have a greater commitment to their jobs and will show a greater profit return than those who believe that they are not valued.

5.6.2 Supervisor Support

Supervisor Support was found to be a questionable predictor of Emotional Exhaustion in Study 1. It was retained in the model for the current study due to the wealth of literature confirming its importance as a predictor of burnout (Jackson et al., 1986; Russell et al., 1987; Seltzer & Numerof, 1988; Davis et al., 1989; Ross et al., 1989; Miller et al., 1990; Razza 1993; Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

Kahn (1993) asserts the importance of supervisor support by stating that hierarchical superiors, by definition, represent their organisation to their subordinates. He notes:

"When superiors give or withhold care, subordinates experience it as systemic as well as personal. They feel cared for or withheld from by their organizations, as represented in the persons of their formal superiors, just as
clients of hospitals or social service agencies feel cared for by those organizations as well as by caregivers. Such institutional caregiving is crucial for caregivers, whose own dependency needs are triggered and heightened by working with dependent others... and who need to feel they can wade into seas of client emotions while remaining securely fastened to the immovable landmarks of their organizations” (p. 562).

Burrows (1989) states that one of the benefits of supervision is that it allows the worker to keep checking that they are working in the right direction. Hare et al. (1988) concluded from their research that interventions should aim at focussing on organisational issues such as supervisor support and peer relationships.

5.6.3 Task Orientation

Task Orientation was identified as a significant predictor of Depersonalisation in Study 1. However, there is little suggesting specific interventions in relation to Task Orientation in the literature. Burrows (1989) suggests general work management practices, such as that workers should set specific goals for each day, week and year. He states that these must be specific, rather than abstract, so that it is possible to tell if they have been achieved.

5.6.4 Work Pressure

Work Pressure was identified as a significant predictor of Emotional Exhaustion in Study 1. Nowack, Gibbons and Hanson (1985) suggested that staff development training on issues such as stress, time management and wellness may reduce poor health habits that contribute to burnout. In addition, Burrows (1989) states that workers need assistance in assertiveness
training and conflict resolution training as many workers just do not know how to say "no" to extra work and extra tasks in their job. In terms of changing worker's perceptions of Work Pressure, he notes that "as an organisation, we can't alter the demands on our services, but we can alter our response to that demand" (p. 10).

5.6.5 **Innovation**

A high level of innovation within the workplace was also predictive of less burnout in Study 1. Cherniss (1991) suggests that one way of alleviating tedium in the human services is to involve professionals in special projects that encourage experimentation, innovation and learning. He states that, in his own research, he found that professionals who have an opportunity to become involved in projects tend to resist burnout better than those who do not.

Watkins (1992) suggested that one of his four identified ways to reduce burnout was to have variety. New projects provide a break from the day to day work and thus provided an opportunity for the individual to be re-energised. Hence, having participants identify projects which they were interested in and could act upon was seen as being an important part of the workshop process.

5.6.6 **Cognitive Resources**

Cognitive Resources was the only common significant predictor identified across all 3 facets of burnout in Study 1. It was hoped that, by utilising a cognitive framework and assisting workshop participants in recognising and choosing active coping strategies in comparison to escape avoidance strategies, this may assist in decreasing their level of burnout.
Whilst it is acknowledged that the workshop approach for staff may have some limitations, in terms of not being able to address organisational constraints or focusing on the responsibilities of managers, there was also some supporting literature for having staff deal with their own issues (Insel & Moos, 1974; Cherniss, 1991; Semler, 1994). Cherniss (1991) states:

“Burnout is fundamentally a condition brought about by a perceived lack of control and self-efficacy at work. Thus, the most effective way to alleviate burnout is to empower the individual worker. When administrators use their power to improve working conditions for staff, the result may be positive; but the staff have not been empowered. Only when staff take the initiative and improve conditions through their own action are they likely to experience the greater self-efficacy and control that lead to significant reduction in burnout. This approach to organizational change differs from the others we have considered in some important ways. Rather than relying on union organizers, administrators, or OD consultants to bring about change, professionals are trained to change their own organizations, and if change is not possible, to function creatively and effectively within the constraints of their organizations. Their competency and self-efficacy are the focus of the intervention, and thus such an approach should be especially effective in alleviating burnout. And the people who have the most to benefit from the intervention are the ones most directly involved” (p. 559-560).

Stevens and Pfoist (1983) found that after three sessions of a problem-solving burnout prevention group for staff who worked with terminally ill patients, subjects commented on increased awareness of burnout and on their efforts to apply problem solving strategies. They also approached leaders for further exploration of concerns and solutions, which led to more productive and effective team meetings.
Otto (1983) makes a similar argument to those purported by Maslach and Leiter (1997). She states that the promotion of stress management (defined as relaxation, exercise, diet, cognitive therapy, assertiveness training) in individuals is always desirable. Her critique, however, is that most of the time these elements are promoted in a manner which ignores or minimises the importance of the social context, including the existing control structures within which people have to function.

Despite this, it was hoped that by participants addressing the identified predictors of burnout from Study 1, they could begin to make choices about taking control of areas of their lives where they could effect change. In addition, where change was not possible, it was hoped that they could start to learn to "function creatively and effectively within the constraints of the organisation".

5.6.7 Social Resources

Social Resources was found to be an inconsistent predictor of Personal Accomplishment in Study 1, most probably due to its high correlation with Cognitive Resources. However, as with Supervisor Support, it was decided to retain it as a variable in the conceptual model due to the wealth of literature supporting its predictive value (Pines et al., 1981; Himle et al, 1986; Savicki & Cooley, 1987; Greenglass & Burke, 1988; Hare et al., 1988; Leiter, 1990; Melamed et al., 1991; Terry, 1991).

Social support has been seen by many researchers to provide a high buffer against stress both within and outside the workplace (Hare et al., 1988; Melamed, et al., 1991; Terry, 1991; van Dierendonck et al., 1998). Leiter (1990) carried out a longitudinal study of 122 nurses in hospitals, and found that
family resources were of equal importance to professional resources in the management of occupational stress. He suggests that research on intervention programmes could be enhanced by the inclusion of components that are designed to develop resources in both areas. He believes that it may be that a dual focus intervention programme on family and professional resources could result in changes that are more substantial or enduring than either one alone.

Other researchers have noted the importance of collegial relationships that are used as social resources within the workplace. Leiter (1990, 1991b) found that the management approach and social environment of the work setting could enhance the incidence of control coping in workers. He found that control copers reported better relationships with their supervisors and coworkers and more opportunities to develop their professional competence. He stated that people are more likely to address problems actively when embedded in collegial relationships rather than in an atmosphere of isolation and distrust. Melamed et al. (1991) suggested that social support may be promoted by any activities which facilitate interpersonal relationships and communication. Hodgkinson (1985) suggests that staff support should comprise three components: a) a regular group forum, b) individual supervision and c) in-service training.

Marks and Hixon (1986) recommend the process of peer group supervision over general group supervision. They defined peer group supervision as a group of staff who have common problems and goals and who meet regularly to present cases formally, share ideas, gain insights and grow professionally. They note that peer group supervision differs from group supervision in that all members of a peer group share equal responsibility for the functioning, outcomes and decisions of the group. They were also clear in stating that peer
group supervision should not serve as a replacement for individual supervision.

Marks and Hixon (1986) conducted a study of 46 new peer groups that they set up. They found that peer group supervision offered the opportunity to increase trust, decrease anxiety and facilitate increased independent and interdependent functioning. They saw all of these factors as being important in child welfare practice. They noted that 34 of the 46 groups stated that peer group supervision should be mandatory.

Greenburg, Lewis and Johnson (1985) noted that there may be obstacles to peer group supervision. They stated that therapists have ambivalent feelings about wanting help and yet fear exposure of their limitations to others. They note that, although the individual may suffer from isolation, there is often a reluctance to reveal mistakes and express negative feelings for fear of disapproval by others.

Potter (1987) believes that building “a network of allies” within the workplace is crucial as they can provide needed information, connect the individual with the right person, and open doors to valuable resources. She notes that “Effective people know how to find things out and get things done. The most effective people have allies throughout the organization. They cultivate friendly relationships in every division and help others. In turn, they can count on allies to help them” (p. 46).

Research on the importance of family and friendships outside the workplace as a source of social support has shown the positive effects that these relationships can have, even within the workplace. According to Russell et al. (1987), relationships outside the workplace also assist in the prevention of burnout.
They propose that programmes designed to enhance social supports for teachers may represent an effective strategy for preventing teacher burnout. Hare et al. (1988) found in their study that satisfaction with informal support from family members buffered nurses against the experience of emotional exhaustion.

Terry (1991) reports that individuals with a supportive family environment rely more on active coping strategies than individuals without family support. She states that a supportive social network offers encouragement and assistance in the development of strategies directed towards management of the problem, as well as providing emotional support to the individual throughout the process. She proposed that individuals without access to social support would rely on other types of emotion focused coping such as escape and avoidance strategies.

The Burnout Prevention Workshop therefore aimed to increase the awareness of the benefits of social support amongst participants of the workshop. It was thought that this would help them focus on the current adequacy of, and the possibility of how to increase their social networks where necessary.

As can be seen above, the literature indicates various ways in which the seven identified predictors of burnout have been utilised in previous studies. The aim of Study 2 therefore was to tie these predictors together to form a comprehensive approach for the management and reparation of the burnout process. The seven identified predictors thus formed the basis of the workshop which aimed at providing cognitive strategies to assist with each of these variables. For example, as Social Resources had been identified as a variable predicting Personal Accomplishment, the building of "quality circles", as suggested by Potter (1987), was incorporated into the body of the workshop.
In this way, it was hoped that each of the seven variables could be addressed and that cognitive techniques and coping strategies would assist staff in reducing their level of experienced burnout.

5.7 Aim of Study 2

The specific aims of Study 2 were as follows:

- To refine and extend some of the findings from Study 1;
- To develop a workshop to assist workers in preventing and ameliorating the burnout process.

While the seven identified variables and the cognitive strategies as to how to make change provided the foundations for the intervention, one of the other fundamental tenets of the workshop was provided by Garden (1991) who builds on the work of Maslach (1982). Her premise is that burnout is a syndrome which is distinguished from ordinary tiredness by the additional component of difficulty in renewing one’s energy. As such, she believes that it is possible that solutions for the individual lie as much in how they spend their time outside of work, as well as inside of work. This is encapsulated by Maslach (1982):

“If all the knowledge and advice about how to beat burnout could be summed up in one word, that word would be balance. Balance between giving and getting, balance between stress and calm, balance between work and home - these stand in clear contrast to the overload, understaffing, overcommitment and other imbalances of burnout” (p. 147).

The theme of developing a sense of balance was seen as a primary goal of the workshop. It was decided that in devising the workshop, the cognitive
resources of the individual would be the major focus of intervention. This was
due to cognitive resources being the most salient predictor of burnout from
Study 1, and Seligman's (1975) proposition that it is the individual's
attributional style that is the greatest determinant of future depression. It was
decided that the Learned Helplessness theoretical premise suggested by the
literature warranted further investigation in order to clarify the contributions
of the work environment versus personal attributes of the individual towards
the experience of burnout. It was hoped that by addressing these issues using
a cognitive framework, this would assist in ameliorating the burnout
experience for participants of the Burnout Prevention Workshop.

5.8 Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Staff who have a negative explanatory style (as defined by
high scores on the Composite Negative Subscale of the ASQ) will also have
high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation and low scores
on the Personal Accomplishment scales of the MBI.

Hypothesis 2: Staff with high levels of Learned Helplessness (as defined by
low scores on the Composite Positive - Composite Negative Subscale of the
ASQ) will also have high Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation scores
on the MBI.

Hypothesis 3: Staff who have been in their current position for 6 years or
more, will have higher levels of Learned Helplessness than those who have
been in their current position for 5 years or less.
Hypothesis 4: Low scores on the Supervisor Support subscale of the WES will be correlated with high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale of the MBI.

Hypothesis 5: Low scores on the Social Resources subscale of the CRI will be correlated with low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale of the MBI.

Hypothesis 6: Individuals who participate in the Burnout Prevention Workshop will have lower levels of perceived burnout at Time 2 than individuals who did not participate in the workshop.

Hypothesis 7: Individuals who participate in the Burnout Prevention Workshop will experience a significant decrease in their Learned Helplessness scores (as defined by the Attributional Style Questionnaire) compared to those individuals who did not participate in the workshop.

Hypothesis 8: Individuals in the Treatment Group will show increases in their scores on the Involvement, Supervisor Support and Innovation scales of the WES and decreases in their Work Pressure and Task Orientation scores at Time 2, compared to the Control Group, whose scores will not change.

Hypothesis 9: Individuals in the Treatment Group will show increases in their scores on the Cognitive and Social Resources scales of the CRI at Time 2, compared to the Control Group, whose scores will not change.
CHAPTER 6

Method

6.1 Participants

Subjects were District Officers from the Department of Community Services, Metropolitan North Division. This was the Division from which the previous sample was drawn, and covers seventeen Community Services Centres, ranging from Katoomba to Wyong and to Bondi. The researcher attended a meeting of the Assistant Managers of the Community Service Centres, who are the direct supervisors of the District Officers, and explained the results of Study 1 to them, as well as the direction of the new research for Study 2. Flyers advertising the research and the Burnout Prevention Workshop were distributed to the Assistant Managers to be placed in the pigeon holes of the 200 District Officers (Appendix D). These flyers asked the District Officers to either volunteer to attend the workshop and complete a pre- and post-test questionnaire, or if they could not attend, to participate by just completing the questionnaires.

6.2 Measures

This study was based upon an interrupted time series design, using both a Treatment and a Control Group. An interrupted time series design was chosen as it was believed that change often takes place in the weeks following an intervention, after participants have had an opportunity to assimilate the information learned and acted upon it, rather than at the conclusion of the
workshop itself. The use of the two groups (Control and Treatment) was to control for factors that may have been occurring independently in the workplaces at the same time that the workshop was offered, that may have confounded the results. The Control Group was therefore used as a stable sample to determine whether changes that occurred in the Treatment Group were attributable to the intervention, or to other external issues.

Change was assessed through two questionnaires, with one being completed eight weeks after the first which, for the Treatment Group, was six weeks after the completion of the Burnout Prevention Workshop. Subjects were asked to respond to four different scales compiled into one questionnaire. A demographic data form and consent form were included with the questionnaire as was a covering letter giving details and information about the study (Appendix E). The scales were randomly ordered for each questionnaire. The questionnaire was placed in a stamped, self-addressed envelope to be returned to the researcher's home address in order to encourage return rates. The scales were:

- The Maslach Burnout Inventory - MBI, (Maslach and Jackson, 1986);
- The Work Environment Scale - WES, (Involvement, Supervisor Support, Task Orientation, Work Pressure and Involvement Subscales: Moos, 1986);
- The Coping Resources Inventory - CRI, (Cognitive and Social Resources Subscales: Hammer & Marting, 1988);
- The Attributional Style Questionnaire - ASQ, (Peterson, Semmel, Von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky & Seligman, 1982);
- Demographic Data.

The Attributional Style Questionnaire, or ASQ (Peterson et al., 1982), is a 12 item self-report measure that asks the subjects to respond to 12 hypothetical
events such as "You give an important talk in front of a group and the audience reacts negatively" and "You get a raise". Subjects provide the cause of the event and rate the cause on 7 point scales corresponding to the dimensions of internality, globality and stability. The ASQ does not create or constrain the causal explanations provided by the subject, but at the same time it allows simple and objective quantification of responses by asking the subject to rate the internality, stability and globality of the causes. The composite score for six negative events is subtracted from the composite score for positive events to yield a single index of attributional style. A low ASQ score indicates that the subjects have a tendency to make internal, global and stable attributions for personal failures, and external, specific and unstable attributions for personal successes. Cronbach's Alphas of 0.93, 0.89 and 0.90 for the internal, stable and global ratings were reported in the original research (Peterson & Seligman, 1984).

The first three of these questionnaires were utilised in Study 1 (the MBI, CRI and WES). The Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson et al., 1982) was selected in order to address the Cognitive Resources variable and the Learned Helplessness hypothesis. It was anticipated that by using a measure that could assess both cognitive resources and attributional style, any changes in these areas would be able to be measured.

6.3 Procedure

In order for staff to be released from their workplaces, a presentation of the previous research from Study 1 and information on burnout was given to the Assistant Community Managers, Care & Protection, who supervise the District Officers. Groups of flyers were then given to the Assistant Community
Managers who were asked to forward the flyers to the District Officers in their office. The flyers were stapled to a Staff Development Nomination form (used if they were attending the workshop) and an additional nomination form (if they only wanted to participate in the questionnaires, and not the workshop). Volunteers for the research returned these nomination forms to the researcher and their participation was then acknowledged in a return letter (Appendices F and G). A final letter and flyer were sent to the ACMs two weeks before the commencement of the course to increase participation where possible (Appendices H and I).

Given the above procedure, consideration was given to the issue of self-selection, as it could be argued that volunteers for the research may have been more motivated than other District Officers to address their levels of burnout, or had more insight into the burnout process. Consideration was also given to the fact that the Treatment and Control Groups were not randomly allocated and that one group may have been more burnt out than the other. Ideally, it would have been better to have asked volunteers to have been available for a set amount of time and then randomly assigned them to either the Treatment or the Control Groups in order to control for the motivational factor. This technique, however, has many inherent problems. For example, it would have been difficult from an organisational perspective to release staff on a conditional basis, stating that they could attend the workshop only to have them return to their workplace. Additionally, it would not have been ethical to withhold the workshop from an individual who really wanted to be involved in the workshop, but was assigned to the Control Group. Thus, it was decided that staff should nominate the group that they wanted to commit to, and for the researcher then to explore the differences between the groups through the available data.
The Control Group were those staff who completed two questionnaires within their workplace, but did not attend the workshop. The Treatment Group were those staff who participated in the Burnout Prevention Workshop and completed the two questionnaires. The Control Group consisted of 19 staff, of whom 16 responded at both Time 1 and Time 2. The Treatment Group consisted of 14 staff, of whom 13 responded at both Time 1 and Time 2.

The Burnout Prevention Workshop curriculum, developed by myself, was written as a structured course with set learning principles as defined by the NSW Department of Community Services Training and Development Branch in their Draft Course Development Guide (undated). The workshop was conducted over 4 days at a departmental training venue, with 2 days being held at the beginning of one week and then a further 2 days a fortnight later (Appendix J). The 2 week break between the two sets of training was used for participants to work on individual plans that they had designed in the first 2 days of training.

The questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix K) were sent to the Control Group via the internal mail of the department, and were designed to arrive at their workplaces on the day the workshop commenced. A correction letter was then sent out on the first day of the workshop, as it was realised that an error had been made in the typing of one of the measures (Appendix L). The Treatment Group completed the first questionnaire the morning that the workshop began, prior to its commencement. All correspondence regarding the research was marked “Confidential” when sent to offices, to ensure that clerical staff did not open the mail.

Six weeks after the completion of the workshop (8 weeks after the first questionnaire), the second questionnaire was administered with a cover letter
(Appendix M). Again, this involved sending out the questionnaires by internal mail to both the Treatment and the Control Groups. Two weeks following this administration, a reminder letter was sent to the total sample (Appendix N).

The questionnaires were then scored according to the guidelines set out in their respective manuals.
CHAPTER 7

Results

The descriptive statistics for the Treatment, Control Groups and Total Sample, as well as further analyses, are presented below:

7.1 Sample

The Total Sample was drawn from the District Officers of the Metropolitan North Division of the Department of Community Services. Table 1 presents the Community Services Centres that were involved in the study and the percentage of respondents from each centre that contributed data to the Treatment Group, the Control Group and the Total sample.

Table 1

Relative Contributions Towards the Sample by Centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumb/Prospect Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Leonards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Druitt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marys</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main contributors to the Total Sample were Manly, St. Marys, St. Leonards, Penrith and Parramatta offices, with participants from these offices constituting nearly 70% of the total sample. The Treatment Group had a greater concentration of people from fewer offices (7 offices in all), whereas the Control Group had a greater spread across the offices (11 offices). While it is not unusual that District Officers will elect to train together, it does mean that there may be some sample bias in the Treatment Group, as particular issues from a single office could possibly confound the results.

Summary statistics for the Treatment Group, the Control Group, and for the Total Sample, for Sex, Age, Area, Religion, Marital Status, Length of Marriage, and number of children are presented in Table 2.
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Sex, Age, Area, Religion, Marital Status, Length of Marriage, and Number of Children for the Treatment Group, the Control Group, and for the Total Sample for Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Catholic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De facto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No children</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in Study 1, the majority of the Total Sample were women (72.7%), with a mean age group of 30-34 years, living in an urban area. The sample mainly identified themselves as being either Protestant (36.4%) or not religious (30.5%). They differed from the original sample of Study 1 in that they were evenly split between being single and married, but with the majority having no children (69.7%).

The Treatment Group, when compared to the Control Group, tended to be fairly similar in their demographic information aside from their religious affiliations and reported length of marriage. In terms of religious affiliations, the Treatment Group identified themselves as mainly being either Protestant or not religious, whereas the Control Group were more evenly spread across the religious groupings. Length of marriage also indicated some differences with those who were married in the Control Group having been married for longer than those in the Treatment Group.

Summary statistics for highest level of education attained, discipline studied and employment demographics for all groups are provided in Table 3.
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Highest Level of Education Attained, Discipline Studied, Full or Part Time Employment Status, and Length of Employment in Current Position for the Treatment and Control Groups and for the Total Sample for Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp'd High Sch.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp'd Tertiary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post Grad.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp'd Post Grad.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employment in Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the sample had completed tertiary level education (72.7%) with the bulk of remaining subjects having either partially or fully completed a Post Graduate degree (24.3%). More subjects in the Treatment Group had completed their Post Graduate studies (21.4%) than the Control Group (0%) who tended to still be completing theirs (21.1%). Main disciplines of study for the Total Sample were Welfare Studies or Psychology, while the Treatment Group had more participants who had undertaken Welfare Studies compared to the Control Group who were more evenly split between the two.
As in Study 1, the bulk of staff were employed full time with 75.6% having been employed in their current position for 5 years or less, and with the majority of the sample (93.9%) having been employed for 10 years or less. These figures are similar to those of Study 1. The Control Group tended to have spent less time in their current position than the Treatment Group who had participants with a greater range of time in the position.

7.2 Maslach Burnout Inventory

Means, Ranges, Standard Deviations and Cronbach’s Alphas were calculated for the Total Sample for each of the three subscales of the MBI, and are shown in Table 4.

Table 4

Summary Statistics for the Three Subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory and Cronbach’s Alphas for the Full Scale at Time 1 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>5-51</td>
<td>0.92 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>2-27</td>
<td>0.74 (5 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>30.25</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>21-46</td>
<td>0.82 (8 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maslach Burnout Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83 (22 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in Study 1, the MBI subscales again showed a wide range of scores and good internal reliability and validity. Cronbach’s Alphas were similar to those of Study 1 (Emotional Exhaustion, 0.89; Depersonalisation, 0.74; Personal Accomplishment, 0.80; Full Scale, 0.71). They were also similar to those reported by Maslach and Jackson (1986) for Emotional Exhaustion and
Depersonalisation, but were slightly higher for Personal Accomplishment (0.90 for Emotional Exhaustion; 0.79 for Depersonalisation; and 0.71 for Personal Accomplishment).

The Means and Standard Deviations for Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment were similar to those of Study 1, although Depersonalisation was slightly higher ($M=8.35$, $SD=5.48$). As in Study 1, Emotional Exhaustion was noted to have higher Means and Standard Deviations than that reported in Maslach and Jackson’s (1986) normative sample ($N=1,528$, $M=21.35$, $SD=10.51$) or for Sandford et al.’s (1997) Australian Child Protection Worker sample ($N=198$, $M=22.9$, $SD=10.4$). Standard Deviations, Ranges and Cronbach’s Alphas for the current sample were similar at Time 2 indicating that the test-retest reliability was substantial. This is shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Summary Statistics for the Three Subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory and Cronbach’s Alpha for the Full Scale at Time 2 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion, $N=29$</td>
<td>31.62</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>10-53</td>
<td>0.90 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation, $N=30$</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>1-28</td>
<td>0.77 (5 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment, $N=30$</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>18-47</td>
<td>0.83 (8 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maslach Burnout Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85 (22 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 **Work Environment Scale**

Means, standard deviations, ranges and Cronbach's Alphas for five of the subscales of the Work Environment Scale for the Total Sample are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

*Summary Statistics for the Five Subscales of the Work Environment Scale, and Cronbach's Alphas for the Full Scale at Time 1 for the Total Sample.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement N=31</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>0.56 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support N=32</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>0.67 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation N=31</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>0.42 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure N=32</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>0.94 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation N=32</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>0.59 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.68 (45 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite having included all items for each of the Work Environment subscales in Study 2, the internal reliability for most of the subscales was considerably lower than those reported by Moos (N=1045; Involvement, 0.84; Supervisor Support, 0.77; Task Orientation, 0.76; Innovation, 0.86), except for Work Pressure (0.80), which was considerably higher. This serves to clarify the low internal reliability and validity of the subscales that was noted in Study 1. It seems that despite having used all the scale items for each of the subscales in Study 2, the alpha levels were not significantly increased. These poor results were similar at Time 2. Results of the Standard Deviations, Ranges and Cronbach's Alphas for Time 2 are shown in Table 7.
Table 7

Summary Statistics for the Five Subscales of the Work Environment Scale, and Cronbach's Alpha for the Full Scale at Time 2 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2-9</td>
<td>0.64 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>0.65 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>-0.14 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3-9</td>
<td>0.80 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>0.59 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66 (45 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that there was such low internal subscale reliability at both Time 1 and Time 2, and as more items were used per subscale than in Study 1, a process of item reduction was carried out on Supervisor Support, Task Orientation and Innovation in order to raise the alphas. This method was also used on the Involvement subscale, but to no positive effect. Table 8 gives the revised Cronbach's Alphas at Times 1 and 2 for the Supervisor Support, Task Orientation and Innovation subscales once the most unstable items had been removed.
Table 8

Revised Cronbach's Alphas for the Five Subscales and the Full Scale of the Work Environment Scale, after Item Reduction, at Times 1 and 2 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>9 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>9 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Full WES</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>40 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item reduction was not carried out on the Work Pressure subscale, as it had high internal reliability with the 9 items, nor on the Involvement subscale as item reduction made little difference to the alpha levels. Five items were removed from the full scale, significantly improving the internal reliability of the individual subscales and the full scale. These items were:

a) "Things rarely get put off till tomorrow" (Task Orientation scale);
b) "Variety and change are not particularly important" (Innovation scale);
c) "There’s an emphasis on ‘work before play’" (Task Orientation scale);
d) "Supervisors really stand up for their people" (Supervisor Support scale);
e) "There’s a tendency for people to come to work late" (Task Orientation scale).

Despite the item reduction procedure, however, Cronbach’s Alpha at Time 2 for the Task Orientation subscale was still low (0.36). Further item reduction did not significantly increase the internal reliability of the subscale, and caution was therefore used in interpreting any results that included this subscale.
7.4 Coping Resources Inventory

Internal reliability measures for the Coping Resources Inventory at Time 1 for the Total Sample are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Summary Statistics for the Two Subscales of the Coping Resources Inventory, and Cronbach's Alpha for the Full Scale at Time 1 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Resources</td>
<td>27.18</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>19-34</td>
<td>0.88 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social resources</td>
<td>37.09</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>21-47</td>
<td>0.76 (12 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Resources Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89 (21 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alphas were similar to Study 1 for Cognitive Resources and the Full Scale, although slightly lower for Social Resources (0.84). The Cronbach's Alphas for Cognitive Resources was higher than that reported by Hammer and Marting (1988) for their normative sample, although lower for Social Resources (N=323, Cognitive Resources, 0.77; Social Resources, 0.78). It was still consistent however, for the Total Scale (.91). Test-retest reliability at Time 1 and Time 2 was shown to be fairly consistent, although there was some increase in alpha for the Social Resources Scale (rising to 0.84), commensurate with the alpha for Study 1. Results are shown in Table 10.
Table 10

Summary Statistics for the Two Subscales of the Coping Resources Inventory, and Cronbach’s Alphas for the Full Scale at Time 2 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Resources</td>
<td>26.55</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>17-35</td>
<td>0.85 (9 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social resources</td>
<td>36.27</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>19-46</td>
<td>0.84 (12 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.5 Attributional Style Questionnaire

Table 11 presents summary statistics for the Attributional Style Questionnaire.

Table 11

Summary Statistics for the Four Subscales of the Attributional Style Questionnaire, and Cronbach’s Alphas for the Full Scale at Time 1 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>10-17</td>
<td>0.62 (18 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>9-16</td>
<td>0.73 (18 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive minus Negative</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>-2-5</td>
<td>0.77 (48 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peterson et al. (1982) have reported Cronbach’s Alphas ranging from 0.44 to 0.69 (N=130). The alphas of the ASQ subscales reported here seem to be commensurate with and higher than those previously reported by Peterson et al., indicating satisfactory internal reliability. Test-retest reliability yielded similar results for the subscales, yet a drop in the overall reliability of the scale
(0.59). This information is presented in Table 12. All the subscales on the ASQ showed a wide range of scores.

Table 12

Summary Statistics for the Four Subscales of the Attributional Style Questionnaire, and Cronbach’s Alphas for the Full Scale at Time 2 for the Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>0.72 (18 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>7-15</td>
<td>0.73 (18 items)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive minus Negative</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-2-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributional Style Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59 (48 items)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6 Overview of Data Analysis

In order to test for multicollinearity within the scales, a Pearson Correlation Coefficient Matrix was calculated at Time 1. As in Study 1, this indicated that while the correlations were moderate in some cases, they did not constitute a collinearity problem. Normality of scale scores was also examined. The existence of skew that remained in some of the variables (Innovation, Work Pressure and Supervisor Support), despite the reduction of items, may mean that the Pearson Correlation is not a reliable indicator of the extent of the relationship. However, the correlations were either so close to 0.0 that there was unlikely to be any relationship of significance, or were so highly significant, that these relationships were likely to remain significant, despite the skew. Table 13 gives the Pearson Correlation Coefficients Matrix for subscale variables.
Table 13

**Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Total Sample for Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalisation, Personal Accomplishment, Involvement, Revised Supervisor Support, Revised Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Revised Innovation, Cognitive, Social, Composite Positive, Composite Negative, Composite Positive minus Negative, and Helplessness at Time 1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Emot</th>
<th>Deper</th>
<th>Pers</th>
<th>Inv</th>
<th>Supv</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Innov</th>
<th>Cogve</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>CoPos</th>
<th>CoNeg</th>
<th>CpCn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emot Exh'n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonal'n</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Acct</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supv. Support</td>
<td>-.59**</td>
<td>-.52**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orient'n</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.36*</td>
<td>-.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Res.</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Res.</td>
<td>-.39*</td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Pos.</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Neg.</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPos-CoNeg</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 33

*p<.05

**p<.01
Emotional Exhaustion scores showed significant positive correlations with Depersonalisation and Work Pressure, and significant negative correlations with Involvement, Supervisor Support, Task Orientation, Innovation and Social Resources. These results were similar to those of Study 1, except for the direction of the correlation of Supervisor Support. Although Supervisor Support was shown to be an inconsistent variable in Study 1, it showed a positive relationship with Emotional Exhaustion in the Stepwise Regression indicating that high Supervisor Support was predictive of high Emotional Exhaustion. In the current study, the negative correlation is consistent with the bulk of the literature which postulates that low Supervisor Support is predictive of high Emotional Exhaustion.

Depersonalisation scores indicated a significant positive correlation with Work Pressure, and negative correlations with Involvement, Supervisor Support, and Social Resources. These correlations were similar to those found in Study 1 and indicated that being involved in social relationships within the workplace, having a positive relationship with their supervisor, and maintaining good social relationships outside the workplace, may help workers stay in touch with and positive about their clients.

Personal Accomplishment scores were significantly positively correlated with Innovation, Cognitive Resources, and Social resources. The direction of the correlations indicated that being encouraged to do things differently in the workplace combined with good social relationships and a positive outlook, may assist workers in maintaining a good sense of self-esteem.
7.7 **Extent of Burnout in the Sample**

As in Study 1, the Total Sample was divided into different levels on each of the MBI subscales (low, moderate, high) so as to investigate respondents' level of overall burnout at Time 1. This information is presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Percentages of the Total Sample for Levels of Burnout on Each of the MBI Subscales at Time 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Low %</th>
<th>Medium %</th>
<th>High %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalisation</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Table indicates that 62.5% of the Total Sample were experiencing high levels of Emotional Exhaustion at the time of the initial survey (Time 1), compared to 52.5% in Study 1. Approximately one-third of the sample were experiencing high levels of Depersonalisation (34.4%), slightly higher than Study 1 (24.4%). Approximately two-thirds were experiencing high levels of Personal Accomplishment (62.5%), which was also higher than Study 1 (56%).

7.8 **Baseline Differences Between the Treatment and Control Groups**

A series of one-way MANOVAS were performed, with the subscales on each of the measures as the independent variables (MBI, WES, CRI AND ASQ) and the two groups (Control and Treatment) as the dependent variable. These were carried out to determine whether or not there were any significant baseline
differences between the Treatment and Control Groups prior to the implementation of the intervention.

MANOVA results on the MBI subscales indicate that there were no significant baseline differences in respondents' level of experienced burnout between the Treatment and Control Groups prior to the intervention ($F = 0.893; df = 3, 28; p=0.457$). This was also true for the WES subscales ($F = 0.975; df = 5, 22; p=0.455$), and the CRI subscales ($F = 0.596; df = 2, 30; p=0.557$).

These results demonstrate that despite the concerns about self-selection bias in relation to those who volunteered for the Treatment Group compared to the Control Group, statistical analyses indicate that there were no significant differences between the groups.

7.9 Testing the Hypotheses for Study 2

A series of MANOVAs and regression analyses were used to test the hypotheses.

7.9.1 Attributional Styles and Burnout

Three linear regression analyses were carried out in order to examine whether a negative explanatory style was predictive of higher levels of burnout. The dependent variables, respectively, were Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalisation and Personal Accomplishment. Both the Composite Positive and Composite Negative scales of the ASQ were included as predictors as there is a possibility of confounding effects between these two variables as there is a
highly significant correlation between them (0.40, \( p<0.05 \)). Results are presented in Tables 15, 16 and 17.

Table 15

**Linear Regression Analysis with Composite Positive and Composite Negative Scales (ASQ) as Independent Variables: Emotional Exhaustion (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coneg (ASQ)</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>0.1931</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Copos (ASQ)</td>
<td>-2.048</td>
<td>-0.305</td>
<td>-1.500</td>
<td>0.1456</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = 10.0\% \)

Adjusted \( R^2 = 3.1\% \)

Results of the linear regression analysis indicate that Positive and Negative attributional styles were not significant predictors of Emotional Exhaustion. The combination of styles only accounted for 10% of the variance for the Total Sample. Note that the figures in the right hand column (% variance fitted last) do not sum to the \( R^2 \) value, as the predictors are not orthogonal.

Results of the Linear Regression analysis in relation to attributional style and Depersonalisation are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

**Linear Regression Analysis with Composite Positive and Composite Negative Scales (ASQ) as Independent Variables: Depersonalisation (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coneg (ASQ)</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.8635</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Copos (ASQ)</td>
<td>-0.969</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>-1.392</td>
<td>0.1756</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = 7.5\% \)

Adjusted \( R^2 = 4\% \)
Positive and Negative attributional styles were not shown to be significant predictors of Depersonalisation. The combination of styles accounted for only 7.5% of the variance for the Total Sample.

Results of the Linear Regression analysis in relation to attributional style and Personal Accomplishment are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

Linear Regression Analysis with Composite Positive and Composite Negative Scales (ASQ) as Independent Variables: Personal Accomplishment (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coneg (ASQ)</td>
<td>-0.442</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>-0.600</td>
<td>0.5540</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Copos (ASQ)</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>1.972</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 13.1\%$  
Adjusted $R^2 = 6.5\%$

While a Negative attributional style was not shown to be a significant predictor of Personal Accomplishment, a Positive Attributional style approached significance (0.06). The combination of styles accounted for 13.1% of the variance for the Total Sample. When Composite Positive was fitted into the model on its own however, it was also found not to be significant at the 5% significance level.

The positive relationship between a positive attributional style and Personal Accomplishment indicates that for every unit increase on the Positive Attribution scale, there is, on average, a corresponding 1.4 unit increase on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. This result suggests that high scores on the Positive Attribution scale may be predictive of high scores on the Personal Accomplishment scale. A larger sample would be needed to clarify the role of
Composite Positive on Personal Accomplishment, however, before definite conclusions could be drawn.

As the majority of the results of the Linear Regression analyses were not significant, they negate Hypothesis 1 that a negative explanatory style would be predictive of high levels of burnout. The only predictor approaching significance was a positive attributional style indicating that individuals with a high positive attributional style score are also satisfied with their sense of themselves and their accomplishments. Given that none of the burnout scales were clearly predicted by the attitudinal measures, these results indicate that people experience burnout regardless of their attributional style. Thus, rather than the negative explanatory style of the individual being the major contributor to the burnout experience, it may well be that environmental factors are the most important.

Two linear regression analyses were used to investigate Hypothesis 2, that high Learned Helplessness scores on the ASQ would be predictive of high Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation scores on the MBI. Results of these analyses are presented in Tables 18 and 19.

Table 18

Linear Regression Analysis with Composite Positive Minus Negative Scale (ASQ) as the Independent Variable: Emotional Exhaustion (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPCN (ASQ)</td>
<td>-1.964</td>
<td>-0.315</td>
<td>-1.727</td>
<td>0.0956</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 9.9\%$  
Adjusted $R^2 = 6.6\%$
Table 18 indicates that a perception of Learned Helplessness was not shown to be a significant predictor of Emotional Exhaustion, accounting for only 9.9% of the variance for the Total Sample.

Results of the Linear Regression analysis in relation to Learned Helplessness and Depersonalisation are presented in Table 19.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance fitted last</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPCN (ASQ)</td>
<td>-0.565</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.953</td>
<td>0.3492</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 3.3\%$  
Adjusted $R^2 = 0\%$

Table 19 indicates that a perception of Learned Helplessness was not a significant predictor of Depersonalisation, accounting for only 3.3% of the variance for the Total Sample.

Overall, these results demonstrate that a perception of Learned Helplessness was not a significant predictor of Emotional Exhaustion or Depersonalisation, therefore negating Hypothesis 2. While the direction of the relationships was as predicted, the lack of significant findings indicates that the individual's causal attributional style is not a significant predictor of burnout.
7.9.2 Length of Employment and Learned Helplessness

Hypothesis 3 proposed that staff who had been in their current position for 6 years or more would have higher Learned Helplessness scores than those who had been in the position for 5 years or less. This was in keeping with Potter's (1987) suggestion that individuals who are not able to escape from stress will accept it and, over time, will not seek alternate means of escape despite the situation having possibly changed. In order to investigate this, the Total Sample was split by the length of time that they had been employed (<5 years, or >6 years), and a T-Test was performed to examine the effect of Learned Helplessness on the two groups. Results are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Results of T-Test on Learned Helplessness (CPCN) and Length of Employment in Current Position: Groups of Staff Employed Less Than and Greater Than 5 Years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Employment in Current Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 6 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>t = 0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that there was no significant difference on the Learned Helplessness measure between those who had been employed for either less than or more than 5 years, which negated Hypothesis 3. However, the small sample size for the group that had been employed for more than 6 years means that this test had limited power.
7.9.3 Supervisor Support and Social Resources as Predictors of Burnout

The results from Study 1 were ambiguous in relation to Supervisor Support and Social Resources as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment. Further investigations were therefore conducted using the current sample in an attempt to clarify the predictive value of these variables. In order to do this, the final models from Study 1 of the Stepwise Regression Analyses were re-run to assess the robustness of the variables.

Initially, a Stepwise regression was run with Involvement, Supervisor Support, Work Pressure and Cognitive Resources as the Independent Variables, and Emotional Exhaustion as the Dependent Variable. Results are presented in Table 21.

Table 21

Stepwise Regression with Involvement, Supervisor Support, Work Pressure and Cognitive Resources as Independent Variables: Emotional Exhaustion (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Supervisor Support (WES)</td>
<td>-3.9360</td>
<td>-0.633</td>
<td>-4.172</td>
<td>0.0003</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = 40.1\% \quad \text{Adjusted } R^2 = 38\% \]

Table 21 indicates that, when the significant variables from Study 1 were re-run on the current sample (N=33), Supervisor Support became the only predictive variable of Emotional Exhaustion, accounting for 40.1% of the variance. This is in striking contrast to the findings of Study 1.

The negative relationship between Supervisor Support and Emotional Exhaustion indicates that for every unit increase on the Supervisor Support
subscale there is, on average, a corresponding 3.7 unit decrease on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale. Results based on this sample indicate that a high score on the Supervisor Support subscale of the WES was highly predictive of low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale of the MBI.

This result supports the bulk of the literature and Hypothesis 4, confirms the validity of keeping Supervisor Support in the conceptual model, but is contrary to the findings of Study 1. However, the current results are more likely to be a better reflection of the role of this variable than that of Study 1 for the following reasons:

a) There were more items in the scale in Study 2 (8 items compared to 4 items), leading to a better reliability than in Study 1 (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.76 vs 0.66 in Study 1);

b) These results are consistent with the anecdotal evidence given by participants during the Burnout Prevention Workshop, and in the feedback session of Study 3 (see following study);

c) Supervisor Support has a higher explanatory power as a predictor of Emotional Exhaustion in Study 2 compared to Study 1 (40.1% fitted on its own, compared with 42.2% variance when fitted after the other 3 variables, i.e; when fitted last);

d) These results are consistent with the literature.

Results of the Stepwise Regression analysis in relation to Cognitive and Social Resources and Personal Accomplishment are presented in Table 22.
Table 22

Stepwise Regression with Cognitive Resources and Social Resources (CRI) as the Independent Variables: Personal Accomplishment (MBI) as the Dependent Variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>% variance explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cognitive Resources (CRI)</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>3.741</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 31.8\%$  
Adjusted $R^2 = 29.5\%$

Table 22 shows that, as in Study 1, when Cognitive and Social Resources were both fitted into the final model, Social Resources dropped out of the model as a significant predictor of Personal Accomplishment. The extent of the variance accounted for by Cognitive Resources in Study 2 was comparable to its final model contribution in Study 1 (31.3%). This result does not support Hypothesis 5, that Social Resources would be a predictor of Personal Accomplishment.

It is also interesting that, while the Composite Positive attributional style on the ASQ was not a predictor of Personal Accomplishment, Cognitive Resources (as measured by the CRI) was. As it can be assumed that Cognitive Resources and a Positive attributional style are reasonably highly related, this would indicate that either the two variables are measuring two very different constructs, or the ASQ is not a robust measure.

Overall, these results indicate that as neither length of employment, a negative explanatory style, nor the individual’s causal attributional style were predictive of burnout, it would seem that the phenomenon of Learned Helplessness is not associated with the burnout process.

In relation to examining the stability of Supervisor Support and Social resources as respective predictors of Emotional Exhaustion and Personal
Accomplishment, Supervisor Support was confirmed as a significant predictor of Emotional Exhaustion, while Social Resources was found not to be a predictor of Personal Accomplishment. This clarifies the findings of Study 1 in relation to the predictive stability of these variables. The results indicate that while Supervisor Support is a critical factor in the burnout process, a positive sense of self is more important for a worker in order to maintain a good sense of self and attitude towards their job than the support of others.

7.9.4 Efficacy of the Burnout Prevention Workshop

In order to examine the efficacy of the Burnout Prevention Workshop, a Repeated Measures MANOVA was performed to determine whether any change had occurred over time on any of the burnout subscales, either within or between the Treatment and Control Groups of Study 2. The scores on each of the burnout subscales at Time 1 and Time 2 served as the independent variables, with the Treatment and the Control Group as the dependent variable.

Descriptive statistics for the Treatment and Control Groups at Time 1 and Time 2, are presented in Table 23.
Table 23

**Descriptive Statistics for the Three Subscales of the MBI for the Treatment and Control Groups at Time 1 and Time 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Control (n=16)</th>
<th>Treatment (n=12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Exhaustion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>30.18</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depersonalisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal accomplishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>29.69</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary statistics indicate that there was little difference between the Means and Standard Deviations for any of the MBI subscales at Time 1 and Time 2 for either the Treatment or the Control Group. Results of the Repeated Measures MANOVA are shown in Table 24.

Table 24

**Repeated Measures MANOVA on the MBI Subscales for the Treatment and Control Groups at Time 1 and Time 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables:</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Over Time) Effect</td>
<td>1.052</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups (Time) Effect</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group By Time Effect</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results depicted here indicate that for respondents' experience of burnout on any of the three subscales of the burnout measure the Control and Treatment Groups have not changed differentially over time. Thus, there was no measurable effect of the intervention of the burnout workshop on participants.
However, the estimated Power of this analysis was only 13%, so while the effect was not measurable, it remains possible that a larger sample or a better controlled study could have yielded a significant result. The current results negate Hypothesis 6.

In addressing Hypothesis 7, a one-way MANOVA was conducted with Learned Helplessness (CPCN) at Time 1 and Time 2 as the independent variable and the Treatment and the Control Group as the dependent variable. This was carried out to examine change over time for the two groups in relation to learned helplessness as an attributional style. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 25.

**Table 25**

Descriptive Statistics for the Composite Negative Minus Composite Positive (CPCN) Subscale (ASQ) for the Treatment and Control Groups at Time 1 and Time 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Control (n = 16)</th>
<th>Treatment (n = 11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPCN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25 indicates that there was little difference between the Means and Standard Deviations for the Learned Helplessness subscale at Time 1 and Time 2 for either the Treatment or the Control Group. Results of the one-way MANOVA are shown in Table 26.
Results of the MANOVA indicate that there was no differential change in attributions of Learned Helplessness between the Treatment or the Control Group from Time 1 to Time 2. Again, the power of the analysis was very low. In this case, the estimated Power was only 5%. It is thought that either a differently designed study (e.g.: matching of Control subjects, different measures etc.) and/or a larger sample size may yield a more powerful statistical analysis and potentially a more significant result in future research. These results do not support Hypothesis 7, that the Treatment Group would experience a greater decrease in their Learned Helplessness scores following the Burnout Prevention Workshop than the Control Group.

A further Repeated Measures MANOVA was carried out to test Hypothesis 8. This proposed that the Treatment Group compared to the Control Group would show increases on the Involvement, Supervisor Support and Innovation subscales of the WES, and decreases in their Work Pressure and Task Orientation scores. The WES variables at Time 1 and 2 served as the independent variables and the Treatment and Control Groups as the dependent variable.

Table 27 gives the results of the descriptive statistics.
Table 27

Descriptive Statistics for the Involvement, Supervisor Support, Innovation, Work Pressure and Task Orientation Subscales (WES) for the Treatment and Control Groups at Time 1 and Time 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Control (n=15)</th>
<th>Treatment (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary statistics indicate that as for the other scales, there was little difference between the Means and Standard Deviations for the WES subscales at Time 1 and Time 2 for either the Treatment or the Control Group. Results of the Repeated Measures MANOVA are shown in Table 28.

Table 28

Results of a Repeated Measures MANOVA on the Involvement, Supervisor Support, Innovation, Work Pressure and Task Orientation Subscales (WES) for the Treatment and Control Groups at Time 1 and Time 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables:</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Groups (Over Time) Effect</td>
<td>1.904</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups (Time) Effect</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group By Time Effect</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28 indicates that the Control and Treatment Groups did not change differentially over time on any of the WES subscales. These results do not support Hypothesis 8.

A final Repeated Measures MANOVA, with Cognitive and Social Resources as the independent variables and the Treatment and Control Groups as the dependent variables was carried out to test Hypothesis 9. This proposed that the Treatment Group would show increases in scores on the Cognitive and Social Resources subscales of the CRI following the intervention, compared to the Control Group who would not show any change. Table 29 gives results of the descriptive statistics.

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Control (n=16)</th>
<th>Treatment (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>37.56</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>36.75</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary statistics indicate that again, there was little difference between the Means and Standard Deviations for the Cognitive and Social Resources subscales of the CRI at Time 1 and Time 2 for either the Treatment or the Control Group. Further Repeated Measures MANOVA results are presented in Table 30.
Table 30

Repeated Measures MANOVA Results on the Cognitive Resources and Social Resources Subscales (CRI) for the Treatment and Control Groups at Time 1 and Time 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables:</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups (Over Time) Effect</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups (Time) Effect</td>
<td>3.330</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group By Time Effect</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results of the Repeated Measures MANOVA presented in Table 30 indicate that the Control and Treatment Groups did not change differentially over time for Cognitive or Social Resources. These results negate Hypothesis 9.
CHAPTER 8

Discussion

The results of Study 2 indicated that, while the Total Sample was experiencing a high level of burnout (as in Study 1), neither the Treatment nor the Control Group changed significantly in their level of experienced burnout over time. While these results suggest that the workshop was not an effective means of reducing or ameliorating staff burnout, it is also possible that the measures used were not reliable indicators of the beneficial effects of the workshop. This point will be discussed, followed by the characteristics of the sample. Some key issues related to the hypotheses will then be addressed.

8.1 The Measures

The majority of measures used in the current study proved to have adequate internal and test-retest reliability. The most notable deficits were on Moos’ (1986) Work Environment subscales. As in Study 1, the Means and Standard Deviations for the Emotional Exhaustion subscale of the MBI were higher than those reported by Maslach and Jackson’s (1986) normative sample, and for Sandford et al.’s (1997) comparative Australian Child Protection Worker sample. This is significant given that Emotional Exhaustion has been found to be the greatest predictor of burnout (Maslach, 1978, 1982, 1986).

While the sample was found to be highly emotionally exhausted, they were also found to have a high sense of Personal Accomplishment. While this dichotomy does not fit the typical burnout profile, these results were consistent
with those of Study 1. They also confirm the work of McMullen and Krantz (1988), who found that burnout did not include a reduced sense of Personal Accomplishment in their population of child care workers.

The validity of the Work Environment Scale was again called into question during this study. Despite having included all the subscale items for each of the subscales used in this study, some difficulties were still noted. On the whole, the alphas on the subscales of Moos' Work Environment Scale were satisfactory, although they were considerably lower than those reported by Moos. In order to maximise the reliability of the subscales, an item reduction procedure was carried out on the Supervisor Support, Task Orientation and Innovation subscales, which significantly improved the alphas at Times 1 and 2. The notable exception to this was for Task Orientation, which was considerably compromised at Time 2, indicating that any results dependent upon this variable were largely unreliable.

Despite these problems, the test-retest reliability for the WES at Times 1 and 2 remained stable (except for Task Orientation), indicating that the difficulty was most likely that of assessing 17 different work environments. A large amount of skew was also noted for some of the variables (Innovation, Work Pressure and Supervisor Support), again indicating the difficulties in assessing a number of different work environments with the one measure. Despite the size of the skew, the correlations between the variables were either so close to 0.0 or so highly significant that the relationships were either likely to remain not significant, or else continue to be significant, in spite of the skew.

It is likely that the inconsistencies and skewed aspects of the variables indicates that the WES was actually a good measure of the work environments being assessed, as the culture and physical aspects of each work environment are
bound to be different and this was reflected in the results. Although these aspects may have affected the results, it is thought that the difficulties experienced with the measure are probably a good reflection of the difficulty in assessing a number of environments with the one instrument.

No significant differences or difficulties were noted for the Coping Resources Inventory or the Attributional Style Questionnaire.

8.2 The Sample

The sample comprised District Officers from the Metropolitan North Division, who volunteered to be a part of research on burnout (N=33). They also self-selected as to whether they would be part of the Treatment or the Control Group. Verbal feedback from participants suggested that the basis of this choice was mainly around whether or not they were able to be released from their workplace to attend the Burnout Prevention training. Those who were not able to be released, or who had alternate commitments on the training days stated that they wished to be part of the Control Group, although this was not necessarily always the case. The Total Sample came from 12 of the potential 17 Community Service Centres, although the Treatment Group was more concentrated, coming from only 7 centres, compared to the Control Group who were spread more evenly across 11 centres.

No major demographic differences were noted between the Treatment and the Control Groups, other than for length of marriage and religious affiliations. Those in the Control Group tended to have been married longer and were more evenly spread across the religious groupings than those in the Treatment Group.
As in Study 1, length of time that workers had spent in their current position was again a telling indicator of the amount of staff turnover that is occurring. The original study, carried out in 1993, found that 90.8% of staff had been in their current position for ten years or less, with 71.1% having been in their current position for 1-5 years, and 19.4% having been in their current position for less than a year. Study 2, carried out in 1995, replicated these results and found that 93.9% had been in their current position for ten years or less, 75.6% had been in their current position for 1-5 years, and that 21.0% had been in their current position for less than a year. While this study was conducted on a smaller sample (N=33), the results indicate that staff turnover appeared to be as high, if not higher, than it was 2 years previously.

The current sample was found to be experiencing a high degree of emotional exhaustion, with 62.5% of respondents indicating that they were highly emotionally exhausted. Approximately one third of the sample also reported having high levels of Depersonalisation (34.4%). Both of these figures were 10% higher than the Total Sample in Study 1, perhaps indicating that respondents chose to participate in the study due to relevance to their own circumstances.

Conversely however, and similar to the findings of Study 1, the Total Sample also had a high sense of Personal Accomplishment (62.5%), perhaps indicating that while respondents were experiencing a high level of burnout, they were also self-motivated and empowered enough to want to participate in a research study. Interestingly, no significant differences were found between the Treatment and the Control Groups level of experienced burnout at Time 1. This suggests that the participants may have self-selected to participate in the overall research, but that there was no difference as to which group they chose to be in. No differences were found between the Treatment and Control
Groups at Time 1 on any of the other measures either, indicating that while there may have been some self-selection bias, there were no major differences between the groups.

8.3 Attributional Styles and Burnout

Linear regression analyses were performed to examine whether a negative explanatory style was predictive of higher levels of burnout as suggested by the literature (Seligman & Schulman, 1986). Results indicated that positive and negative attributional styles only accounted for a small amount of the variance for both Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation (<10% in each case). A positive attributional style approached significance as a predictor of Personal Accomplishment (0.06). When fitted into the regression model on its own however, it was still not a significant predictor.

These results negate Hypothesis 1, that a negative attributional style would be a predictor of high levels of burnout. The only relationship approaching significance was between a positive attributional style and Personal Accomplishment, indicating that individuals with a high positive attributional style score were likely to be satisfied with their sense of themselves and their accomplishments. Given that none of the burnout scales were clearly predicted by the attitudinal measures, the results indicate that people experience burnout regardless of their attributional style. Thus, rather than the negative explanatory style of the individual being the major contributor to the burnout experience, it may well be that the environment is more salient despite the individual attempting to maintain a positive attitude. This supports the findings of McMullen and Krantz (1988) in relation to their sample experiencing high Emotional Exhaustion and high Personal Accomplishment at
the same time. It also lends weight to the propositions by Maslach and Leiter (1997) that work environments are a greater contributor towards burnout than the personal characteristics and style of the worker.

Linear regression analyses were also used to explore Hypothesis 2 that a high perception of Learned Helplessness would be a predictor of high Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation. Results of the analyses negated this hypothesis, with a high perception of Learned Helplessness again accounting for less than 10% of the variance in both Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation, and neither relationship being significant.

The lack of significant findings indicates that causal attributional styles were not significantly linked to the burnout process for this sample. It is recognised that these findings are only based on a small sample (N=33) and therefore further research should aim to replicate this study with a larger population. These findings are contrary to those of McMullen and Krantz (1988) who found that caregivers who experienced Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalisation tended towards lower self-esteem and Learned Helplessness. They are also contrary to those of Collins (1995) who found that lecturers who felt a diminishing sense of control over the parameters of their work also experienced Learned Helplessness and burnout.

8.4 Length of Employment and Learned Helplessness

Hypothesis 3 contained a proposition based on the findings of Schill & Marcus (1998). They found that male inmates who had been incarcerated for 5 years or more had greater levels of Learned Helplessness than inmates who had recently been incarcerated. They suggested that prolonged exposure to an
uncontrollable situation may have an influence on attributional style. Hence, it was proposed that staff who had been in their current position for 6 years or more would have a higher perception of Learned Helplessness than staff who had been in the position for 5 years or less.

Results indicated that this was not the case and that there was no significant difference between the groups. It was noted that the group that had been employed longer was significantly smaller ($n=6$) than the group that had been employed for 5 years or less ($n=24$). However, the lack of significance in the findings was so great as to suggest that even a larger sample size would have been unlikely to yield a significant result. This negated Hypothesis 3 and did not support the previous research (Schill & Marcus, 1998). The results also negate Potter's (1987) proposition that those who are employed in untenable situations will often remain there despite being occasionally offered alternate means of escaping the situation.

8.5 **Learned Helplessness and Burnout**

In examining the overall findings in relation to attributional styles, Learned Helplessness and burnout, it was recognised that unlike Seligman's (1975) dog who could not escape, District Officers do have a way out of the Department of Community Services. This is of course through the path of resignation and if one takes into consideration the staff turnover figures, this has been the option that staff appear to have been utilising. In reviewing the results, including the combination of high Emotional Exhaustion with high Personal Accomplishment, it appears that perhaps District Officers do not suffer so much from a sense of Learned Helplessness, but perhaps a good sense of self and self-esteem which helps them survive in a difficult and bureaucratic
Alternately, it may be that those who have become burnt out choose to leave the system in order to recover. These possibilities should be investigated further.

8.6 Supervisor Support and Social Resources as Predictors of Burnout

In order to address the queries raised in Study 1 about the inconsistency of Supervisor Support and Social Resources as predictors of Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment, the final stepwise regression analyses from Study 1 were re-run. Emotional Exhaustion and Personal Accomplishment were used as the dependent variables, to gauge their predictive value with the current sample. Hypothesis 4 proposed that contrary to the findings of Study 1, low Supervisor Support would be a predictor of high Emotional Exhaustion.

The initial regression analysis was run with Involvement, Supervisor Support, Work Pressure and Cognitive Resources as the Independent Variables, and Emotional Exhaustion as the Dependent Variable. Results indicated that Supervisor Support became the only significant predictor of Emotional Exhaustion for this sample, and accounted for over 40% of the variance. In addition, a significant negative correlation was noted between Emotional Exhaustion and Supervisor Support.

These findings were in direct contrast to the results of Study 1, which found that high Supervisor Support was predictive of high Emotional Exhaustion. In the current study the negative correlation was consistent with the bulk of the literature (Jackson et al., 1986; Russell et al., 1987; Seltzer & Numerof, 1988; Davis et al., 1989; Ross et al., 1989; Miller et al., 1990; Razza, 1993; Maslach &
Leiter, 1997) which has suggested that low Supervisor Support is predictive of high Emotional Exhaustion.

Thus, the present findings are consistent with the theoretical stance of Huebner (1993) and Razza (1993) who note that supervisors are able to be either a source of, or a buffer against, burnout. It is possible that the larger number of work environments being assessed (17 versus 12) may have affected the contribution of supervisor support as a predictor variable in Study 1.

Alternately, it is also recognised that there were higher concentrations of workers from some of the centres represented in the Treatment and Control Groups in Study 2, with 5 particular centres having more than 3 subjects each in the Total Sample. More than 3 subjects with such a small sample size would contribute approximately 10% towards the results, potentially skewing the results. This concentration of workers from particular centres could account for the extent of skew found on some of the variables (Innovation, Work Pressure and Supervisor Support). It may thus be that the significant findings in relation to Supervisor Support in Study 2 are therefore representative of what was happening in particular offices, rather than across the larger sample as a whole. An alternate view could be that the concentration of subjects from certain centres actually allowed the measures to more accurately assess what was occurring, without the "watering down" effects mentioned earlier.

Social Resources was then entered with Cognitive Resources into the final regression model for Personal Accomplishment. As in Study 1, when only these two variables were entered into the model, Social Resources dropped out as a significant predictor of Personal Accomplishment. Cognitive Resources then became the only significant predictor of Personal Accomplishment, accounting for just over 30% of the variance, which is considerable. This
suggests that a positive sense of self and attitude towards those around them is a major contributor to the well-being of the worker.

The lack of a significant relationship between Social Resources and Personal Accomplishment did not support Hypothesis 5. This refutes the bulk of researchers who have found that social support has provided a high buffer against stress both within and outside the workplace (Hare et al., 1988; Leiter, 1990, 1991b; Melamed et al., 1991; Terry, 1991).

These results contradict many other researchers. For example, van Dierendonck et al. (1998) found that participants with strong social resources were most able to benefit from their intervention. They also refute Collins' (1995) research findings that support from management and good communication are essential in keeping good morale in Social Work lecturers. The results are also contrary to the suggestion by Potter (1987), that building a "network of allies" within the workplace is crucial. Finally, they counter the proposal by other researchers (Russell et al., 1987; Hare et al, 1988; Terry, 1991) that relationships outside the workplace assist in the prevention of burnout.

An alternate possibility is that as friendships and networks take time to build, it is possible that change was not able to be effected within the 6 week pre- and post-test time frame between questionnaires. As such, any changes that the Treatment Group may have actually made could have taken place after the post test questionnaire was returned, and were therefore not measured. This indicates that a longitudinal design over a greater period than the six weeks used here may have been more effective in measuring the possibility of change for the workshop respondents.
8.7 **Efficacy of the Burnout Prevention Workshop**

A series of MANOVAs was used to determine if any significant changes had occurred between Time 1 and Time 2 for either the Treatment or the Control Group on any of the variables being measured.

Hypothesis 6 proposed that individuals who participated in the Burnout Prevention Workshop would have lower levels of perceived burnout at Time 2 than the Control Group. The Repeated Measures MANOVA results indicated that there was no significant change between the Treatment and the Control Groups from Time 1 to Time 2. These findings suggest that the Burnout Prevention Workshop was not effective in producing change for the participants and negates Hypothesis 6 that there would be a significant positive change for Burnout Prevention Workshop participants.

However, the results were in contrast to the verbal feedback given by participants during the workshop. They reported that they had found the workshop extremely useful in raising their awareness of burnout issues and refocusing their responsibilities towards themselves in terms of intervening in the burnout process. This verbal feedback was similar to that provided by subjects to Stevens and Pfost (1983) who, after their workshop, found that subjects commented on increased awareness of burnout and on their efforts to apply problem solving strategies.

The current results do not support the findings of other researchers in terms of successful short term interventions that assisted in ameliorating the burnout process (Slutsky, 1981; Jenkins & Calhoun, 1991; Hyman, 1993; Van Dierendonck et al., 1998). The results are also contrary to the recommendations by Hare et al. (1988) who concluded that interventions should be aimed at
focussing on organisational issues such as supervisor support and peer relationships through the use of instrumental coping strategies. They suggested that this could best be done through staff training and work related counselling. The current results indicate that this has not been an effective measure.

The results do support the recommendations of Lee and Ashforth (1993) who noted that the progressive nature of burnout indicated that planned interventions should be designed for the long haul and deal with the root cause, not just the symptoms. Like other researchers (Otto, 1983; Leiter, 1988; Maslach & Leiter, 1997), they suggested that interventions should be organisationally based; possible areas of intervention might include restructuring work units to allow for greater decision latitude and work autonomy and less situational uncertainty. Any intervention programmes should be monitored and mechanisms for strategy evaluation, feedback and follow up planning be inherent in their inception and development (Lee & Ashforth, 1993). While elements of these ideas were present in the current research, the long term strategies and organisational aspects were missing.

These findings also support the recommendations of Jenkins and Calhoun (1991), who recommended the promotion of “quality circles” within the workplace. This was in order to identify problems in the workplace and to develop cost-effective solutions to them so as to provide an opportunity for direct modification of sources of stress. While the current workshop aimed to produce a supportive peer environment where participants could solve problems as a group, it was not done within their own workplaces, where the emphasis would have been on greater environmental, rather than personal change.
MANOVA results in relation to Hypothesis 7 that the Burnout Prevention Workshop would reduce participants' perception of Learned Helplessness, indicated that there was no significant change in attributions of helplessness for either group between Time 1 and Time 2. This negated Hypothesis 7 and, combined with the earlier results in relation to attributional styles, indicated that Learned Helplessness may have little theoretical relevance to the concept of burnout. This is contrary to propositions by Potter (1987) that Learned Helplessness is a natural outcome of feeling out of control and powerless at work, and contrary to the findings of McMullen and Krantz (1988) and Collins (1995). However, the lack of association between Learned Helplessness and burnout may explain why there have been so few studies in the literature linking the two theoretical constructs.

Hypothesis 8 proposed that the Treatment Group would show increases in their scores on the Involvement, Supervisor Support and Innovation subscales of the WES and decreases in their Work Pressure and Task Orientation scores following the intervention. This proposition was based on the findings from Study 1, which identified that these WES variables were significant predictors of burnout and therefore needed to be the focus of change if burnout was to be reduced. Results of a Repeated Measures MANOVA on the variables indicated that there was no significant change for any of the variables over time, negating Hypothesis 8.

Based on the same theory, that Cognitive Resources and Social Resources were the two significant CRI variables that were predictive of burnout in Study 1, a Repeated Measures MANOVA was carried out to determine any differential change over time for the two groups. Results indicated that there was no differential change over time for either group, negating Hypothesis 9.
This lack of change on any of the significant predictors of burnout that were identified in Study 1 suggests that either:

a) the workshop was ineffective at implementing change for any of the participants on any of the identified constructs;

b) the period between when the pre- and post-test questionnaires were administered was not long enough for participants of the Burnout Prevention Workshop to have begun to effect change; or

c) the quantitative measures used were not reliable indicators of what was happening for respondents and actually measured different constructs.

These issues will be discussed further in the next section.

8.8 Limitations of Study 2 and Further Research

One of the limitations of both studies has been that measurement of the significant variables has been in terms of quantitative, rather than qualitative analysis. While the use of standardised quantitative measures is valid, it is possible that the instruments used did not measure the change that participants stated that they experienced during the workshop. It is also possible that the small sample (N=33) resulted in there not being enough power to really measure the efficacy of the workshop and that a larger sample might have yielded different results.

On reflection, the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis may give a more comprehensive view of the participants' experience. This would be similar to research carried out by Hyman (1993) who used psychometric instruments in a retrospective pretest design, but also gained feedback through the use of open-ended questions.
It may also be that change for the Burnout Prevention Workshop participants was not able to be measured at the 6 week follow up, as it was too early to gauge the changes that they were intending to make. While other researchers have noted the benefits of short term interventions (Slutsky, 1981; Jenkins & Calhoun, 1991; Hyman, 1993; van Dierendonck et al., 1998), it may be that, as this Workshop addressed such specific variables, change by the participants needed to be more planned and took longer to implement than the time frame allowed. This would be particularly pertinent for some variables such as those involving the building of social support networks. It may be that a longitudinal analysis over a 6-12 month period would have been a more appropriate design. The difficulty of course would remain that, with the high turnover rate of staff, there could be a high drop-out rate from the research.

Kyriacou (1987) makes some suggestions as to the need for practitioner skill training and organisationally focussed, rather than individually based interventions. He noted that strategies aimed at improving teachers' professional skills and competencies to meet the demands of being a teacher tended to be more successful than those aimed at developing psychological techniques to reduce the experience of stress. He also suggested that much attention still needed to be given as to how schools could reduce stress for their staff by the adoption of management practices, organisational and administrative arrangements, staff relationships, working conditions and curriculum processes that minimise sources of stress within the schools' control. These recommendations suggest that, despite the fact that Cognitive Resources was the most significant predictor across the burnout variables, change must also occur at an external rather than just an internal level to be an effective precursor to the reduction of the burnout experience. Thus, the results of the current research indicate that it is not enough to assume that by
changing the individual, the constraints and inherent difficulties of the organisation can be minimised or denied.

Feedback from Workshop Participants during the intervention also indicated that it would have been useful to examine managers' and supervisors' experience of burnout. It is envisaged that this would require a tailored intervention programme for managerial staff, incorporating awareness of burnout issues for themselves as well as employees. Future research should incorporate this into an intervention programme.

Interventions aimed at reducing the potential for burnout within an organisation must be based on the established work groups of an organisation (Leiter, 1988). This would be to target both the pattern of communication occurring in the work setting and the attitudes and feelings that workers have about their work. This strategy would have raised the efficacy of the current research.

8.9 Theoretical Implications

Theoretical implications from the current research can be summarised as follows:

- Learned Helplessness and causal attributional styles (positive and negative) do not appear to be associated with burnout.
- Supervisor Support was confirmed as an important predictor of Emotional Exhaustion. This supports the literature and confirms the anecdotal evidence given by participants. Due to the size of its contribution towards
the variance for Emotional Exhaustion, it should be included as a critical factor in future research.

- Social Resources was not confirmed as a predictor of Social Resources. As Cognitive Resources was the only predictor of Personal Accomplishment, it appears that a positive sense of self and positive feelings about your job come from within, not from others around you. Consequently, Social Resources is probably not worth including in future burnout research.

8.10 Conclusion

Study 2 aimed to both refine and extend the results of Study 1 and to devise an effective intervention for staff for the prevention and reduction of burnout. Use was made of a longitudinal interrupted time series design. Results of the current quantitative measures indicate that there was no significant change for participants of the Burnout Prevention Workshop in terms of reducing their levels of burnout. However, given anecdotal feedback following the workshop, it is suggested that the instruments chosen may not have adequately measured change. Study 3 will aim to address this problem through a further study aimed at gaining qualitative data about participants' experience of the Burnout Prevention Workshop and its perceived level of efficacy in terms of reducing burnout.
CHAPTER 9

Study 3: Qualitative Analysis

9.1 Study 3: Introduction

The statistical findings of Study 2 indicated that the Burnout Prevention Workshop was not beneficial for participants, with the majority of hypotheses that proposed that the workshop would reduce participants' burnout not being supported. This was in contrast to the anecdotal feedback given during the workshop, which indicated that the Treatment Group had found the workshop to be both relevant and useful.

The rationale for Study 3 was therefore to gain further information and clarification as to the Treatment Group's perception of the workshop and to determine any personal or professional changes that they may have made as a result of their attendance. As the quantitative findings of Study 2 were unequivocal in demonstrating a lack of reduction in burnout levels for the workshop participants (using standardised measures), it was thought that qualitative research methods may provide additional useful information of participants' experience of the workshop. It was hoped that this would shed light on participants' experience of burnout and suggest possible alternate interventions appropriate for Child Protection workers.
9.2 A Qualitative Model

Qualitative analysis has been shown to be effective in giving open-ended information to a researcher about the research issue, rather than closed-ended questions, which do not allow the participant to give more than the required answers. As Studies 1 and 2 both employed quantitative measures, it was believed that a qualitative analysis of the Treatment Group's experience of the Burnout Prevention Workshop might provide information not available through the statistical analyses reported earlier. The qualitative method chosen was one of Co-operative Inquiry (Reason & Heron, 1995), as it was deemed most appropriate to the organisational context of the Department of Community Services. Additionally, it was also similar to the interactive format of the previous research that the Treatment Group had already participated in (the Burnout Workshop in Study 2).

Reason and Heron (1995) have described Cooperative Inquiry as one of several methodologies which emphasises participation. It usually involves small groups of people who meet together and design the process of inquiry as it evolves, rather than designing the process beforehand, utilising a traditional research proposal. They note that in traditional research the roles of researcher and subject are mutually exclusive. The researcher only contributes the thinking that goes into the project and the subjects only contribute the action to be studied. In Co-operative Inquiry these mutually exclusive roles are replaced by a co-operative relationship based on reciprocal initiative and control so that all those involved work together as co-researchers and co-subjects. Both the participants and the researcher generate ideas about the project's focus and design and then draw conclusions from it. Whereas Reason and Heron (1995) suggest that traditional research has method as the primary focus and that subjects are subordinate to it, the primary goal of Co-operative Inquiry is to
create a community of inquiry to provide further "knowing" or depth of meaning to an issue.

Reason and Heron (1995) suggest that while Co-operative Inquiry overlaps with qualitative and naturalistic research methods, it is also significantly different from them because it invites people to join in the co-creation of knowledge about themselves. They describe Co-operative Inquiry as being a fully participatory process in which people engage together in cycles of action and reflection. In doing so, they have an opportunity to develop their critical awareness of the theories and ideas they bring to their behaviour and the extent to which their behaviour and experience are congruent with these theories. Thus, in the process of inquiry, both theory and practice are developed.

9.3 Qualitative Analysis and Burnout

A limited number of studies have utilised qualitative analysis in their research on burnout. Goelman and Guo (1998) reviewed the literature on burnout in child care workers in early childhood settings. They found that the factors that contributed to burnout included: wages and working conditions, unclear, ambiguous or conflicting job descriptions, low levels of communication and social support in the workplace, educational background and employment history, personality factors and perceptions of child care work. They argued that there is a need for more longitudinal research and for retrospective research on individuals after leaving the field due to burnout. They proposed that qualitative research methods such as ethnography, case study and action research could provide additional depth, meaning and detail on the experience
of burnout and could complement and extend the many quantitative studies in the child care area.

Dewe (1992) found that the use of a combined qualitative and quantitative design model was superior in giving information, particularly when a factor analysis of his coping checklist showed that the checklist he was utilising was not a robust measure. His research involved conducting an exploration of primary and secondary appraisal in relation to work stress with 73 staff of a New Zealand company that was planning to restructure. Through the use of open and closed ended question surveys, he was able to determine and draw conclusions about the factors that made the situation most demanding and then gave possible solutions, despite the difficulties with the standardised measure.

Gould, Tuffey, Udry and Loehr (1996) conducted a two-phase research project designed to examine burnout in competitive junior tennis players. The first phase quantitatively identified which players were the most burnt out and qualitative interviews were then conducted with them. Content analyses of the interviews identified mental and physical characteristics of burnout as well as reasons for the players burning out. Recommendations for preventing burnout in players, parents and coaches were able to be made as a result of the research.

Bennett, Ross and Sunderland (1996) also used a qualitative and quantitative design model, with the qualitative data backing up their quantitative results. In their examination of the relationship between stressors, rewards and burnout in 174 HIV/AIDS volunteers, they used two standardised measures to look at burnout and the concept of being a volunteer. They found that 21% of the variance identified in the measurement of burnout could be accounted for by stress and reward factors, with qualitative interview data supporting the importance of rewards.
Janz, Wren and Israel (1995), in their study of 51 AIDS prevention and service projects, used quantitative (closed-ended survey questions) and qualitative (in-depth, open-ended interviews) to identify sources of stress in staff. They found that staff working in AIDS prevention and service projects, regardless of project focus, perceived significant levels of stress due to too much work, rapid organisational growth, burnout, and problems with staff retention and communication. Significant factors that were rarely reported included too little work, discomfort with the target population and personal health risk concerns. They concluded that health education interventions needed to take a comprehensive approach that included altering the psychosocial-environmental conditions that give rise to stressors.

9.4 Qualitative Analysis and Child Protection

Qualitative analysis has also been used as a research method in the Child Protection area. Gilgun (1991) asserted that qualitative research is a scientifically sound procedure and that qualitative methods should be used in the design of longitudinal research on child abuse and neglect. In her 1992 journal article she describes the process of generating hypotheses from empirical, qualitative data by building on both induction and deduction and developing the research design over the course of the research. She noted the conceptual framework, research question, sample and hypotheses evolve in response to the empirical patterns that the researcher discovers during the course of the research. She proposed that this kind of discovery-oriented approach helps build knowledge of the situation that is to be measured and changed.
Wells and Freer (1994) critiqued the literature on intensive family preservation services that serve to prevent unnecessary out of home placement of children. They found gaps in knowledge that they suggest could be filled appropriately by exploration with qualitative methodologies. These gaps were related to the context of service delivery, the theory of family preservation practice, the process of service delivery and the conceptualisation and meaning of service outcomes.

Rushton and Nathan (1996) carried out a qualitative study of social service departments in London in order to explore the provision of supervision by team managers in a high-pressure work environment. They conducted 2 focus group discussions with 12 social workers responsible for child protection cases, centering on the structure and content of supervision, the emotional impact of child protection work, risk assessment and antidiscriminatory supervision practice. Their results highlighted the difficulties in protecting adequate supervision time, but detailed an approach for integrating skills that were identified as being necessary for child protection supervisors through the use of staff development training courses.

Scott (1998) explored the process that Australian social workers used in conducting assessments in a child protection service. She conducted in-depth interviews and observations of practice while carrying out a semi-longitudinal design approach in the assessment of 10 families. Highly detailed data were collected from 42 observations of practice and 123 interviews with 12 hospital social workers and 15 child protection workers on how their assessments evolved over the life of the cases. She found marked differences between the 3 professional groups she was observing, particularly in relation to the variables to which they attended. Doueck, Bronson and Levine (1992) in their discussion of issues that child protection agencies might consider when evaluating the
impact of risk assessment implementation, recommended that both qualitative and quantitative measures should be used, rather than just one or the other alone.

9.5 Qualitative Research and Work Environments

Qualitative and quantitative research has also been conducted in an organisational context. Jex, Adams, Elacqua and Lux (1997) carried out a comparison study examining the question of whether scale measures of work related stressors accurately reflect the day to day experience of employees, or whether qualitative measures may be more effective. They conducted a study of 151 female clerical employees and asked them to complete measures of common work stressors, strains and self-esteem. Stressors were also measured using a qualitative methodology based on critical incidents. They found good convergence between the two types of stress measures (qualitative and quantitative), although there was some indication that order effects may have led to method bias in the qualitative procedure. Both sets of measures explained a significant amount of variance in strains, although the scale measures explained more. Self-esteem was only able to be measured by the standardised scale, suggesting that scale measures may be more influenced by dispositions than qualitative measures.

Sullivan and Bhagat (1992) reviewed and summarised 2 decades of empirical literature on the relationship of organisational stress with job satisfaction and job performance. Their research suggests that, despite improvements in the analytical methods of investigation, many of the studies reviewed did not consider the role of reciprocal relationships that evolve over time. They recommended four ways of improving the quality of methodological design:
using multiple methods of assessment, process based research designs, qualitative research and interdisciplinary frameworks.

Hugentobler, Israel and Schurman (1992) describe the implementation of a longitudinal multimethodological research and intervention project. This was aimed at examining the relationship between occupational stress and psychosocial buffers (social support, participation and influence over decision making) and health outcomes, as well as how to reduce work stress and improve employee health. They found that the combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques (semi-structured individual and focus group interviews, field notes and survey data) increased confidence in their research findings and strengthened the process and outcome of needs assessments, programme planning, implementation and evaluation. They found that this approach was particularly useful in identifying and understanding problem areas and in developing and evaluating appropriate health education interventions.

In one of the most interesting recent studies, Glisson and Hemmelgarn (1998) examined the effects of organisational characteristics (including organisational climate and interagency coordination) on the quality and outcomes of children’s services systems. They collected both qualitative and quantitative data over a 3 year period describing the services provided to 250 children by 32 public children’s service offices. Their findings demonstrated that organisational climate (including low conflict, cooperation, role clarity and personalisation) was the primary predictor of positive service outcomes (the children’s improved psychosocial functioning) and a significant predictor of service quality. In contrast, interagency coordination had a negative effect on service quality and no effect on outcomes. They concluded that efforts to
improve public children's service systems should focus on creating positive organisational climates rather than on increasing interagency coordination.

9.6 Further Aims

Study 3 aimed to gain further information as to the Treatment Group's experience of the Burnout Prevention Workshop and their interpretation of the results of the intervention. In addition, it was hoped that further information could be gleaned as to what strategies or tools, not included in the Burnout Prevention Workshop, Treatment Group participants would have found useful to prevent burnout. A review of the literature indicated that a qualitative research design should best be able to provide this information.

The aims of Study 3 can therefore be summarised as follows:

a) to gain an understanding of how the participants of the Burnout Prevention Workshop made sense of the findings of Study 2;

b) to gain further information as to different conceptual frameworks, strategies or tools that the participants would have found useful had they been included in the Burnout Prevention Workshop;

c) to ask for their suggestions as to how to ameliorate District Officer turnover within the Department of Community Services.

9.7 Research Questions

Research Question 1: What sense did the Treatment Group participants from Study 2 make of the results of the workshop?
Research Question 2: What else would the Treatment Group participants of Study 2 have found useful to have been included in the Burnout Prevention Workshop?

Research Question 3: What suggestions would Treatment Group participants make as to how best to ameliorate District Officer turnover within the Department of Community Services?
CHAPTER 10

Method

10.1 Participants

Participants of Study 3 were a proportion of the Treatment Group who had attended the Burnout Prevention Workshop (Study 2). Of the original 14 who had attended the workshop, 8 volunteered to participate in Study 3, representing 57% of the original Treatment Group.

10.2 Measures

A qualitative analysis design (Co-Operative Inquiry) was implemented for Study 3. Reason and Heron (1995) describe Co-Operative Inquiry as a method where the researcher and subjects enter into a co-operative relationship based on reciprocal initiative and control so that they all work together as co-researchers and co-subjects. As such, a small focus group was conducted with a proportion of former Treatment Group participants who had volunteered to gain and give feedback on the outcome of Study 2. The discussion from this focus group was audiotaped. The tape was then transcribed (Appendix O), and a thematic analysis was carried out using three raters who needed 100% concordance to determine a theme. This method of thematic analysis diverged from the procedure of Co-Operative Inquiry. It was hoped that by obtaining themes through a procedure involving inter-rater concordance, this would give greater reliability to the themes elicited from the transcript.
10.3 Procedure

A letter was sent to all the Treatment Group participants from Study 2 ($N=14$) inviting them to attend a half day feedback session on the results and outcome of Study 2 (Appendix P). Their acceptance was returned in a self-addressed envelope, which was provided by the researcher so as to encourage compliance.

Eight of the original treatment group attended the half day feedback session (57%), with another three participants expressing regret that they would be unable to attend. Prior to the focus group, participants of Study 3 were informed that they would be given feedback of the quantitative results of Study 2. They were also informed that if they participated, they would be asked to give further information and clarification as to their interpretation of the findings of Study 2 and their overall experience of the Burnout Prevention Workshop. Verbal permission was sought and gained from them to audiotape the session. Once again, confidentiality was assured.

During the focus group session 9 general questions were woven into the conversation. These were:

1. Do you think that the workshop worked for you?
2. If so, how?
3. If not, why not?
4. What changes did you make as a result of attending the workshop?
5. Did you work to your Final Personal Plan?
6. What difficulties did you experience following the workshop?
7. What personal or professional differences would have helped/did you need in order for you to make change?
8. What systemic/structural changes could you think of that would help alleviate District Officer burnout? What suggestions would you make?

9. Was there anything happening in your own life that affected your ability to change things for you?

Following the session, the audiotape was transcribed by the researcher. Each paragraph of the transcript was then treated as a response and numbered separately, so that it could be rated. This transcript was then given to two independent raters, one a Masters student in Clinical Psychology, and the second a PhD student in Clinical Psychology. In addition, the researcher also rated a transcript. All three raters are practicing registered psychologists. They were provided with seven sheets of paper, each bearing meta-themes that had been created by the researcher based on the Research Questions being asked. These were:

1. Accuracy of results of Study 2
2. What the results of Study 2 meant for participants
3. Changes made as a result of attending the workshop
4. Difficulties encountered (systemic/personal) that hindered change
5. Suggestions to improve the Burnout Workshop
6. Further suggestions to help alleviate burnout in District Officers
7. Other themes

The raters were then asked to collate the numbered responses from the transcript under these meta-themes. Following this analysis, the researcher tallied the responses of the three raters and noted common themes that the raters had identified and areas where they differed. The three raters subsequently met again to discuss concordance of the responses that they had disagreed upon. All responses that were identified as themes required a 100%
rater concordance for them to be included in the results. These thematic results are presented in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 11

Results

The small focus group session was held in November 1995, 4 months after the completion of the Burnout Prevention Workshop.

11.1 General Overview of Results

Participants of the focus group were informed of the statistical results of Study 2. Most expressed initial surprise that there had not been tangible positive outcomes evident in the statistical data, as they had all perceived the workshop as being beneficial. Upon reflection however, participants recalled that they had been more negative in their responses to the quantitative questionnaires at Time 2 than they had been at Time 1. They attributed this to a number of factors:

• being hesitant at Time 1 to admit the extent of their negative affect (ie: "faking good" phenomena);
• feeling safer at Time 2 to express a truer degree of negative affect;
• having greater awareness of burnout;
• having a greater recognition of their own feelings and degree of burnout.

Subjects were asked if they had found the workshop beneficial. The majority of participants stated that they believed that they had benefited from the workshop in that they:

• had a greater awareness of burnout issues;
• were more aware of the emotional state of others around them;
• felt that they were more in control of their own processes and less reliant on expecting others or the system to provide for them;
• had recognised that their needs were unlikely to be fulfilled and sought new employment or different career paths.

Four out of the eight participants who attended the focus group were actively making new career choices, with two of these already having gained separate employment or moved into another area.

11.2 Thematic Suggestions

Based on the general questions that were woven into the course of the focus group discussion, raters identified and categorised the following themes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes Related to the Workshop</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Themes                       | • That participants did not feel as though their levels of burnout had increased, but rather that their levels of awareness about the burnout process and factors that contributed to it had increased  
• That the workshop allowed participants to be more honest and to become more confident in recognising how they were feeling  
• That participants did not become worse following the workshop, but became better at what they did and could look after themselves better as a result of the workshop  
• That participants felt that the burnout problem was recognised and validated during the workshop  
• That the burnout workshop assisted workers in decision making about their careers  
• That the burnout workshop assisted workers in recognising and attending to their own feelings of being burnt out leading them to acknowledge this more readily at Time 2  
• That workers were able to apply some of the workshop techniques within their work environments  
• That some District Officers may have been too burnt out to attend the workshop  
• That there was a recognition and validation that workers’ negative feelings are a natural part of child protection work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation of the Results in Relation to the Three Facets of Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• That District Officers were not as highly depersonalised as they were emotionally exhausted because they do care for their clients, and that the calibre of current staff is very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the nature of the people that District Officers work with (i.e; the clients) is inherently stressful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That District Officers need to provide an internal sense of self-affirmation as the Department does not provide this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That workers can retain a high sense of Personal Accomplishment because they can get support from each other and do not take on organisational issues as their own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the characteristics of being a “helper” lead workers to not recognise or attend to burnout in themselves, because they do not want to let others down</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindrances to Effecting Change within the Work Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• That if participants had changed but management had not, it decreased the efficacy of the workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The negative attitudes of other staff members who had not attended lowered participants’ motivation to carry out change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the departmental culture is to resist change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That some managers were also burnt out, and their cynicism led to a decrease in motivation to effect change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That some participants’ relationship with their supervisor impeded their honesty in order to effect change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions to Assist in Decreasing Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• That managers and staff attend the burnout workshop together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That managers do the burnout course for themselves, for their own burnout issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That a whole unit attend the workshop first and then look at treatment of the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That a facilitator should analyse the interactions between staff and their manager and give feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• That the Burnout Prevention Workshop should be offered at different levels of training, and that the levels should be spaced out to give staff the opportunity to evaluate their progress in between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managers to be given power for discretionary leave for workers who have been working hard/long hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More holidays/8 weeks leave per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues in Relation to Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Training is inadequate/not based on reality/not useful – simplistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training does not address the reality of the job and tends to minimise the problems that workers face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training should acknowledge prior learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training should be ongoing as part of a worker’s career development, not just done as a 3 month block when a District Officer joins the Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increments should be tied to training, rather than competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training should be given as a reward for time in the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• External training is too expensive/not able to be afforded by offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Departmental structure sabotages training. Training is not seen as necessary by managers/the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Officers are too busy to do training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of these themes were tangential to the initial questions being asked of participants, with themes generally focussing on the inherent structural difficulties within the organisation of the Department of Community Services. While participants readily admitted their own negative feelings and the mismatch of their ideals with the District Officer position, they saw the role as being inadequately provisioned by the organisation, making this mismatch inevitable for the majority of workers.

Various extracts that elicited these themes for the raters are presented below:

### 11.2.1 Themes Related to the Workshop

- That participants did not feel as though their levels of burnout had increased, but rather that their levels of awareness about the burnout process and factors that contributed to it had increased

  DO2: "I certainly would say that the workshop was worthwhile, in that anything that improves understanding, awareness, self-awareness, ability to
acknowledge and validate what’s happening has got to be good and I really
do think that’s what the change in this course is about. I don’t think it got
worse. I think we got greater awareness, and things that were presented in
the workshop for me made sense, you know there were some concepts, and
some sort of frameworks that helped understand why situations that occur in
the organisation, you know that niggle and nag.”

and

DO2: “The structural stuff. Yes, the organisational structural stuff. I mean
that’s just one thing that comes to mind immediately. I feel that I’ve, you
know I didn’t have a sort of a framework to understand that, and I’ve got a
better understanding of that now. So, yeah, I don’t think that the explanation
for me was that it made me feel worse, or it got worse, it’s about awareness.”

- That the workshop allowed participants to be more honest and to become
more confident in recognising how they were feeling

DO7: “I think it gave us license, to be more up front.”

- That participants did not become worse following the workshop, but
became better at what they did and could look after themselves better as a
result of the workshop

DO3: “… Like I don’t think that because our results show that our
group, you know, the Treatment group got worse, I don’t think that that
means that we have become worse, I think that it means that we have become
better, at what we do, because we can look after ourselves. We can say “Hey
there’s a problem here, let’s try and work at it” and if we can’t that’s OK, it’s
not just me, and that sort of stuff…”

- That participants felt that the burnout problem was recognised and
validated during the workshop
DO8: "Can I just say, from my point of view, it had an effect, because it validated a lot of stuff that I would waft in and out of. So I guess at a gut level I was managing my burnout, like I'd feel at the end of my tether and then whatever I'd do, I'd pull back or whatever I'd do, and then I'd cruise again for a while, and so it was like that, it was that sort of way. But, having come onto the workshop, I was more able to actually validate what my feelings were, and what the process that I was going through, ... but actually I think that this helped me look after me a bit more, and make decisions that were going to be better for me, and just say, "Well, managers, other staff are just going to have to get on with it, you know this is the real world, I'm going to do something for me." So for me, it validated some stuff and helped me make some me decisions."

• That the burnout workshop assisted workers in decision making about their careers

DO3: "Well, I got a new job. That was one of my plans. I worked hard at that one. But, I think that was a result of the recognition that I was already at that point, but, and this is my interpretation of the results, doing the workshop didn't push me out, but it helped me to understand better the need for me to move on..."

• That the burnout workshop assisted workers in recognising and attending to their own feelings of being burnt out leading them to acknowledge this more readily at Time 2

DO2: "Is it possible that just the experience of the workshop meant in fact that our scores increased, made it easier for us to, the second round of questionnaires made it easier for us to acknowledge the experience?"

DO5: "I think 'Oh, definitely'..."
• That workers were able to apply some of the workshop techniques within their work environments

  DO3: "... and as individuals we are discovering how to make changes, and learning how to make changes, and this is why this burnout feedback stuff is very valuable, to say, well at least it will have that to empower people to have that responsibility and to be okay about it."

• That some District Officers may have been too burnt out to attend the workshop

  DO2: "Just to get back to the fact that both we and the Control group, self selected in for this, it occurs to me that, it is my subjective impression that there are people out there in DO land, who are, I would think a great deal higher on burnout and who also would rate much lower on Personal Accomplishment, I suspect maybe there is a major bunch out there who you haven’t tapped into because they have chosen not to be [here]..."

• That there was a recognition and validation that workers' negative feelings are a natural part of child protection work

  DO3: "There has to be the recognition I think, that it doesn’t necessarily matter what you do as far as training, recruiting, whatever, the nature of the work that we do, the very nature of it, we’re not going to change it because there are kids who are being abused, and we’re going to have to deal with that, and I think that recognising that and validating people’s feelings, that it’s OK sometimes to feel like you’re at your wits end, it’s OK sometimes to not have the answer, you know, it’s OK to have a break sometimes. And if that is developed as part of our job, the fact is, the quality of staff will just increase..."
11.2.2 Explanation of the Results in Relation to the Three Facets of Burnout

- That District Officers were not as highly depersonalised as they were emotionally exhausted because they do care for their clients, and that the calibre of current staff is very high

  DO3: I guess what that says to me, is, and I guess that’s been my experience, of most people that I work with, that although people are almost at their wits end, there’s still an element of caring for the clients that they work for and because of that, they have a sense of “Well I will get joy out of that”. So that they are at their wits end, and they will acknowledge it, but they still value the people, so that the depersonalisation stuff drops, because they still want to give whatever they have got left to those people, and I think that says something about the calibre of staff that are employed.

- That the nature of the people that District Officers work with (ie; the clients) is inherently stressful

  DO8: “I wonder how much of it actually has to do with our client group, and the fact that our client group usually stuff up their lives more, make bad life decisions, have come from, have had poor parenting and so are poor parents, and are the victims of poor parenting…”

  DO8: I actually think that that’s maybe something valid to consider. That we’re always dealing with people, who for the most time stuff themself or stuff their lives up, whether it’s their own doing, or outside doing and we’re always, nearly always coming in, to right something, to correct something…”

- That District Officers need to provide an internal sense of self-affirmation as the Department does not provide this
DO3: "Because most of the work that we do, we don’t get thanked for, I think as a skill, you’ve got to look for your own affirmation, you’ve got to look for it yourself, because noone’s going to bring it to you, and therefore we do, we look for it."

DO4: But even people who go and get other jobs, it’s not like, “Oh, I’m burnt out, I’m so hopeless and useless, I can’t do anything,” and they go off on the dole or go off and do something else. For the most part, people go off to do other jobs where they still see themselves as being worthwhile, you know what I mean, it doesn’t wear themselves down so they see themselves as being hopeless or useless people, they go off and do other things."

- That workers can retain a high sense of Personal Accomplishment because they can get support from each other and do not take on organisational issues as their own

DO1: "Maybe we get support from each other, and that way we don’t, we know that it’s not us as individuals, it’s the higher powers that is, something. Yeah, and we don’t take it on board ourselves or something."

- That the characteristics of being a “helper” lead workers to not recognise or attend to burnout in themselves, because they do not want to let others down

DO4: "I think that that’s the added part about what you’re saying, the first two parts are up high and then personal accomplishment, you’re saying it’s the characteristics of the helper being in there, that’s probably what makes people hang in until they’re dead! Instead of the recognition of saying “oh well, you know, you know it’s not really me, or I’ve got to make some positive changes”, it’s this other part about “Well we’re helpers, I know that if I quit now, well we’re sort of letting everybody down”, so you just hang in
and hang in until you're this burnt out wick. You know, because you can't recognise it."

11.2.3 Hindrances to Effecting Change Within the Work Environment

In general, participants of the workshop reported that there was a lack of change within the work environment to support changes that workers had made/wanted to make. Themes that followed were:

- That if participants had changed but management had not, it decreased the efficacy of the workshop
  
  DO4: "So, but if we go back saying "We see things in ourselves, or how we feel about burnout", and the way we're managed doesn't change, then it's not effective."

- The negative attitudes of other staff members who had not attended lowered participants' motivation to carry out change
  
  DO5: "I think also, everyone else. You know you walk in really positive and with all this stuff, and yet other people who hadn't done it was going "Yeah". Because it wasn't an office thing, and I think it's really hard, whereas if everybody had walked in with that same really positive attitude, then I think that maybe things would have been, if only for a week, like it wouldn't have mattered, but you just felt like as soon as you walked in you got shot down so..."

- That the departmental culture is to resist change
  
  DO7: "It's a culture of the department, of pulling you back down. It's a very rigid framework of the department. It exists on that mentality for its own survival."
• That some managers were also burnt out, and their cynicism led to a
decrease in motivation to effect change

DO1: “Well, for instance, you know how we talked about those baby
photos, and having that competition. So, I thought “Oh yeah, you know, I’ll
try that and sort of get everyone together” and when I mentioned it in a
Team Meeting, the person that knocked it on the head and was really
cynical and down about it was the manager! “Oh no, that’s been tried
before and it never works”

and

DO1: “But when the DO’s look at some of the managers, it’s like they’re
burnt out, it’s fucked!”

• That some participants’ relationship with their supervisor impeded their
honesty in order to effect change

DO5: “I have some reservations about how or whether that would work...
But I think that it’s how you feel with your manager as well, if you’re feeling
like it’s been going on for so long and you haven’t been listened to, then
you’re not likely to come along and say “Oh this is what I want”’. Anyway,
that’s how I feel, I don’t think it’s being trivialised, I don’t think it’s being as
truthful as you would like to be, whereas if you’re feeling comfortable with
your manager you can say whatever and that would feel OK, but it would be
hard to get a hold of people that feel comfortable with their supervisor, and
therefore would be honest.”

11.2.4 Suggestions to Assist in Decreasing Burnout

• That managers and staff attend the burnout workshop together

DO4: “Don’t you think that the Department is suffering from burnout, not
individuals? Because, you know I saw that what you gave to us needed to
be offered to managers, not just staff, staff need to go and have more coping stuff, like I know that it's good to have an understanding, but if you're treating burnout in a unit say, it needed to be; staff go off and learn where they are and acknowledgement of that, but managers need to have better understanding, and then need to be treated as a group, because. So you needed to have like managers and the people that they supervise go off and do a workshop on burnout, and then the responsibilities for the managers is as much to work with those people in solving it, as expecting the people to do it, because this department would say "If you're burnt out, you go and do a burnout workshop, and you fix it up, and come back", and that seems really dumb. But the organisation itself needs to address it, to go to a burnout workshop and change.”

- That managers do the burnout course for themselves, for their own burnout issues

DO8: "I think the managers programmes should be twofold, I think that it should be so that managers can recognise burnout in themselves, and so that managers can recommend, can recognise and assist staff when they notice staff burning out, so like both, one so that they don't burn out themselves, or they can recognise burnout themselves, but also so that they can look after their staff, so two different focuses, two separate courses, burnout for yourself, burnout for... managing burnout for staff.”

- That a whole unit attend the workshop first and then look at treatment of the problem

DO4: "Because I probably think that if you were wanting to do say, any work group in saying whether they were burnt out or something, and if that was something that they needed to address it, I'd suggest that they do a workshop, and then you talk about burnout and what you want to do.
Because, until it's done, like there is not a lot of understanding, it's more like "This is where I am, and I'm feeling bad or low", or whatever it is, but after you've done the workshop you can have a, for me, it's a broader understanding of what's happening in burnout, and then you could come together as a group to do a 'What are you going to do about it or what needs to happen'."

• That a facilitator should analyse the interactions between staff and their manager and give feedback

DO4: "I think there should be some workshops where managers attend with the staff they supervise, so that someone else gets to analyse the interactions between that person and their staff and to offer criticism and develop ways of doing things ... So if you had someone else, where you attended a workshop, they could say "How do you deal with these situations?" or even more basic like how you set up systems with them about supervision, about giving and getting feedback."

• That the Burnout Prevention Workshop should be offered at different levels of training, and that the levels should be spaced out to give staff the opportunity to evaluate their progress in between

DO3: "I see burnout training as being different levels of training with the first type of burnout training being "This is what burnout is: Things to be aware of", then several months, or a year later, come back, "This is what we talked about in Burnout 1, this is Burnout 2, where are you up to now?" To give people a chance to sort of evaluate, so that initially they've got the chance to try and deal with it, but because of the nature of our work and all that sort of stuff rather than "Oh, you've done the burnout workshop that's it". ...So you have 3 months this year, and then maybe a year later you can have Burnout 3 and then Burnout 4. That sort of programme."
• Managers to be given power for discretionary leave for workers who have been working hard/long hours

DO4: "I think there should be some discretionary leave as well for our managers and staff to work out together, so if someone says "I’m not particularly ill, but I’m not particularly well" then the manager says "It’s OK, take a couple of days off over the weekend and don’t come in". Because if you say it’s sick leave or stress leave, then there’s again there’s this process that you have to go through to justify what you’re doing or someone is labelled as not coping, whereas if you can say "I acknowledge that the work that you’ve done this week has been particularly difficult, don’t come in tomorrow", and if you can do that 5 days a week, 5 times a year, you know it’s like, I think it’s time well used."

• More holidays/8 weeks leave per year

DOI: "Given though that we work with drama and stress and crisis and like emotionally charged situations, day in, day out, you would think that we would get more holidays than 4 weeks a year, like to get over some of that emotional exhaustion or like I know I take 4 weeks at a certain time of the year, and that only does me like 7 months and then from there I’m sort of plodding, and then by the time my holidays come around again I’m like “blugh”.

11.2.5 Issues in Relation to Training

• Training is inadequate/not based on reality/not useful – simplistic

DO5: "I mean, they go through family assessment stuff that you probably would have done anyway before, and for every topic; drug and alcohol, non English speaking background, mental health, disability, they would go through family assessment time after time in a different context, and you’d
think, "Well, I’ve got it, I know it, let's go onto something a little more practical, like how to engage the families in starting a family assessment, how to bring the topic up”. Stuff like that was never done, it was just a rehash of uni, and very little, like just the top, basic stuff.”

- Training does not address the reality of the job and tends to minimise the problems that workers face

DO5: "I think, it's really minimised, the reality of the job, the effects that it can have on you, especially in training. It’s very much said to you, that "Well you know you might be feeling this way now, but with lots of experience you won’t feel that way”, and that’s not the case…”

- Training should acknowledge prior learning

DO3: “Well, I think that we should go back to just simple acknowledgement stuff. That if there’s a minimum requirement that someone has to have before they take on the job, stuff like child development, they need to know child development, but they don’t have to go to DO training course to learn that. They should know family assessment models whatever, people should know that, and if they don't know that then the qualifications that people are seeking to do the job are inadequate…”

- Training should be ongoing as part of a worker's career development, not just done as a 3 month block when a District Officer joins the Department

DO3: “The first three months everyone does a weeks training on a particular thing and then in three month’s do a bit of training in advanced practice and so it becomes an ongoing career development training.”

- Increments should be tied to training, rather than competencies
DO3: "But that, that's where Ongoing Career Development Training should come in. I think before you get your increment, you should do level four of the training of DOCAP, and that's where you need to incorporate it, and if you don't do level 4 training, you don't get your increment..."

- Training should be given as a reward for time in the job

DO7: "I think, incorporated in that advanced DOCAP, which you do every 2 years or so, where you go out again for another few months or whatever, commute between either Kamballa or Glebe or whatever, but intertwined into that, that you have the sort of training that you've been doing like with us as well. That's talking about where you are personally, combined with having a deeper understanding as to your role as a DO. And it's also giving you valuable time out. If you're out of the office for the length of time that DOCAP does now, and I would see it as a pat on the back that "Yes you've survived 2 years, 4 years, whatever, we will now push some more information into you, and skill you up even more, and also reward you by giving you some more training".

- External training is too expensive/not able to be afforded by offices.

Internal training is limited - in terms of what is offered/number of places

DO4: "..the only courses we see that come through are the ones that are offered by outside organisations that are worth hundreds of dollars, and they say "Oh here's a course on such and such, oh its worth 300 dollars" and they just put it down...."

DO3: "I think there were 3 courses for Child Protection, one was at Bidura, it was very good, it was fun, but it was limited to like 15 people."
• The Departmental structure sabotages training. Training is not seen as necessary by managers/the organisation

DO8: "I actually think that the structure that we work in sabotages training, because DO’s are normally so busy doing Child Protection that they’re constantly focussed on the urgent, and they can’t focus on the important, and I think the structure, I think managers, need to take responsibility for building in training time. Because at the moment it’s actually up to the DO, and when you are past your eyeballs in work, the last thing you think of is taking 3 days out... and I just think that the whole system that we have for people in Child Protection sabotages training and I think there needs to be a rethink of the way managers build in training or the department builds in training, rather than just you know “Put up your hand if you’re free”. DO’s aren’t ever free."

DO2: "...and I think there is a culture that it is a kind of optional extra luxury as opposed to necessary."

• District Officers are too busy to do training

LB: "One of the difficulties that they’ve found with training... was that in actual fact Care & Protection people don’t come."

DO7: "Because they’re so busy!"

DO4: "You don’t get a chance!"

11.2.6 Issues in Relation to Recruitment

The participants of Study 3 also had a number of views in relation to how recruitment should be carried out:
• Should use burnout information in recruitment in relation to who is susceptible to burnout

DO4: “Yeah, well to use this information in recruitment... and to hear the people ringing up saying “Oh, I always wanted to be a DO”, and you go, and they've no idea what it’s about, and I think “Gees, this is where we need to start. These people are setting themselves up to be burnt out very quickly”, because you say, “Do you know what it’s like to work in a bureaucracy?”, “Oh no, but I really want to be a DO, I want to help people.”

• Need clarification of professional qualifications accepted when recruiting, rather than taking people from diverse educational backgrounds and experience

DO4: “...but we also need to use what you’ve done back at recruitment, and bring up about qualifications. I’ve had these big discussions, because people ring up, and they've given you a list of about 6 qualifications that you can have, and obviously there are dozens and dozens of qualifications... And so there’s this argument about whether everyone has to have a Social Work degree from Sydney Uni, or whether they can be other people, other things, and other life experiences to come in and, to my mind, it’s silly recruiting from this group.”

• An Information Night should be provided for new District Officers before they join the Department

DO5: “I think I was one of those people that would have rung up and said “Look, I’ve always wanted to be a DO”. And never knew... It would be really useful if we could have, like an information night for people that are applying. Get some DO's to say, “Look, this is what it’s like”. It gives them experience, it gives them whatever it is, to try and get them more into the personal stuff, not just into the framework of the department, but into what
it means for an individual to work as a DO. So, I mean, if I would have known that, I think that I would have reconsidered.”

- That new recruits have high expectations of the job, and the reality is different

DO5:  “No, it’s just, I’ve got a real thing about the training. I found it really inadequate. I was in the field for 8 months before I started the training, and I found it completely inadequate, really not based on what we do at all, just based on this fantasy about what it’s supposed to be like, and then you go in there and you get people there that haven’t actually been in the field that have just gone straight into training and “Oh wow, yes, excellent, I love this job”, and you go “No, just wait till you get…”, and it’s really not reality, so people are going in there expecting a lot, and you expect so much, and then it doesn’t happen, and you think “Oh God” ‘cos your expectations have been built to the stage where you think “Oh, it’s going to be like this and things are going to work out”, and your first day on the job they don’t, and you think “God!”…”

- Suggestion to not train people for 12 months

DO4:  “The other part is, don’t train people for 12 months. Some people come in, do the job for 12 months and don’t provide them with training and then, if they leave, you haven’t wasted the money on training them, you train them after 12 months because they’re more likely to stay around.”

11.2.7 Organisational Issues

A major issue for the group was that the Department of Community Services needed an organisational awareness of the burnout process. Themes related to this were as follows:
• The organisation needs to concentrate on existing staff, rather than recruiting new staff, which is expensive

  DO6: “I can recommend to the powers that be not to waste thousands, tens of thousands of dollars on recruitment and to start concentrating on the good people that are already here, instead of going through the process, after 12 months they piss off, because they’re sick to death of it, and then they get a whole new swag of people here. I don’t know why.”

• Managers need to change issues around urgency versus importance

  DO4: “Yeah that’s what I was saying and I agree with DO8, I think that there’s a lot more responsibility on the managers to be able to do that. It’s changing what’s urgent and what’s important because particularly in Child Protection, the whole thing is focussed on urgency, rather than importance, and there are these, lots of articles coming through now, with some places unallocated Category 3’s, you know after 3 months, no repercussions, so what’s important and what’s urgent! And there’s this thing about that because you set in train a particular process that you are required to follow through regardless of what the outcome is... and that’s, we’re really stupid about how we work and what we do.”

• The Department needs to affirm people in their own skills

  DO3: “I teach at TAFE and one of the subjects is Child Protection and it’s for the Certificate in Welfare course which is a departmental qualification to be a DO, and that’s a basic TAFE course, Child Protection. And what we want is to fine tune specific skills, like the relevant legislation, like the format that we use to assess a family, so that we can put all the details on the computer. Like those sorts of things need to be covered, but, if we’re getting qualified people, we’re getting people generally who have brains, people with common sense,
and need to affirm people in those skills, not deplete them and take away from them.

- That District Officers need career progressions, and that career opportunities should be given to people so that staff with potential are kept rather than lost

DO4: "It is actually terrible, I'm acting AM [Assistant Manager] at the moment, and I'll use DO5, especially as she's raised herself as an example, but that's where it needs to be addressed, rather than just in our unit, because we say "Oh, we've trained this person, a good worker, whose got lots of potential". But that's a contradiction, if I know it's a good worker whose got lots of potential, they're not going to stay! That's the really dumb part, why I would I expect that DO5's going to hang around and be a DO for the next 5 years. She's not going to do that, but as a department, why lose that? So why say "Oh well, we've trained her to be a DO, $50,00, and now she's going to go after 12 months". That's dumb, you know, there are positions coming up that I know that DO5 wants to do, for a few days a week or even full time. Why not use that as a progression? If the department doesn't lose this person, we lose a DO's position, but we can get another one...

DO7: But you would have lost her anyway...

DO4: Yeah, if you're going to go to another organisation and leave us altogether, or we provide avenues for people to do other things, to keep them interested, and interesting."

- That one manager can be responsible for their team experiencing burnout

DO4: "For me, it made it seem, and what I thought was really bad as well, is that if you have 16 people working in an office, 16 DO's working in an office
and you have one person, and particularly if that’s a manager, that is ineffective or burnt out or doing wrong, the impact that that has, like that’s really, really unfair that 16 people should suffer, and they do suffer, because of the behaviour or the inabilities of one person, and you just think, “That’s a really stupid way for an organisation to work”. You end up with 4 or 5 DO’s leaving and you keep the person who’s not being effective and the other people who are going to get burnt out and leave, all for the sake of this one person.”

11.2.8  Issues Related to Methodology

One of the group also noted the inherent potential for bias in the statistical analysis of Study 2:

• That it was not a random allocation of staff to the two groups (Treatment/Control)

DO2: “I’m just looking at the figures here, the contrast between the Control group and the Treatment Group, and I guess you need to take into account the fact that people were not randomly allocated to those two groups, and we’re here because we self-selected to be here. So, I’m just trying to feed you something for the discussion section!”.
CHAPTER 12

Discussion

12.1 Introduction

Results of Study 3 suggest that while the actual measure of burnout (the MBI) did not indicate a decrease in burnout levels at Time 2 for participants following the Burnout Prevention Workshop (Study 2), it would seem that they still found the workshop to be highly beneficial.

The most significant benefits for participants appeared to be the awareness of their own burnout processes, and the conscious decision-making around what they needed to do for themselves to ensure optimal psychological well-being. For some participants, this appeared to be an acceptance of what the organisation could and could not provide, and for others it appeared that this recognition led to them attempting to find either alternate employment or different career avenues within the Department of Community Services. The beneficial aspect of this appeared to be that participants made active, conscious decisions in relation to their careers. In so doing, they therefore did not perceive themselves as being either incompetent, helpless, or unable to do their job, but rather saw that their employment needs were not able to be matched to the provisions of the job that they were currently employed in.
12.2  The Research Questions

12.2.1  Research Question 1
The initial research question of Study 1 asked what sense the Treatment Group participants made of the results of the workshop. Thematic results in relation to participants’ perceptions of the workshop indicated the following:

• That participants did not feel as though their levels of burnout had increased, but rather that their levels of awareness about the burnout process and factors that contributed to it had increased;
• That the workshop allowed participants to be more honest and to become more confident in recognising how they were feeling;
• That participants did not become worse following the workshop, but became better at what they did and could look after themselves better as a result of the workshop;
• That participants felt that the burnout problem was recognised and validated during the workshop;
• That the burnout workshop assisted workers in decision making about their careers;
• That the burnout workshop assisted workers in recognising and attending to their own feelings of being burnt out leading them to acknowledge this more readily at Time 2;
• That workers were able to apply some of the workshop techniques within their work environments;
• That some District Officers may have been too burnt out to attend the workshop;
• That there was a recognition and validation that workers’ negative feelings are a natural part of child protection work.
These themes appear to indicate that participants generally perceived the Burnout Prevention Workshop as being both positive and beneficial. Reasons given included:

(i) They were able to carry out some of the techniques from the Workshop within their own work environments;

(ii) They appreciated the ability to be honest within the training environment and the safety to express their true views;

(iii) That these views were then usually validated by the researcher and their colleagues;

(iv) That the ability to express their views allowed them to clarify their thoughts on issues and also allowed them to recognise how they felt about these issues;

(v) That the workshop allowed them to recognise the inherently stressful nature of Child Protection work and placed the burnout issue within a context of the nature of their work, the organisation and their own individual make-up;

(vi) That they did not perceive themselves as being more burnt out at the conclusion of the workshop, but had a much greater ability to recognise their feelings of burnout and to then attend to their own needs as a result of this recognition;

(vii) That the safety of the workshop environment and their own increased awareness of burnout issues assisted them in being more honest about their degree of burnout in the second round of questionnaires than they had prior to the workshops commencement.

Themes elicited from the participants in relation to their quantitative scores on the three facets of burnout were as follows:
• District Officers were not as highly depersonalised as they were emotionally exhausted because they do care for their clients. Also, the calibre of current staff is very high;

• The nature of the people that District Officers work with (ie. the clients) is inherently stressful;

• District officers need to provide an internal sense of self-affirmation as the Department does not provide this;

• Workers can retain a high sense of Personal Accomplishment because they can get support from each other and do not take on organisational issues as their own;

• The characteristics of being a "helper" lead workers to not recognise or attend to burnout in themselves, because they do not want to let others down.

These responses reflect some basic characteristics as to how the participants of Study 3 saw themselves and others in the role of District Officer. These characteristics included:

(i) Having a good sense of self, and the ability to reaffirm this for themselves without having external reaffirmation provided within their working environment;

(ii) A desire to help others;

(iii) A desire to support their colleagues, to the point of not attending to their own needs;

(iv) A desire to be good at their job.

In addition, responses related to the findings from Study 2 included comments on the nature of Child Protection work and the difficulties of working within the Department of Community Services. Themes included:
The recognition that the nature of the work, the client base and the organisational structure are all sources of stress;

Recognition that the Department of Community Services does not reaffirm workers in their job;

Recognition that the current calibre of staff is high within the Department of Community Services and a feeling of concern that they are not valued by the organisation, as evidenced by its perceived lack of care in relation to them.

12.2.2 Research Question 2

The second research question from Study 3 asked what else Treatment Group participants would have found useful to have been included in the Burnout Prevention Workshop. Responses to this question seemed to fall into two categories: a) what had hindered change for participants following the workshop and b) what may have been more useful to include in the workshop, or how the workshop was run that would address these issues.

Participants were asked to volunteer reasons as to what had hindered their ability to change following the Burnout Prevention Workshop. Hindrances included:

- That if participants had changed but management had not, it decreased the efficacy of the workshop;
- The negative attitudes of other staff members who had not attended lowered participants' motivation to carry out change;
- That the departmental culture is to resist change;
- That some managers were also burnt out, and their cynicism led to a decrease in motivation to effect change;
• That some participants' relationship with their supervisor impeded their honesty in order to effect change.

Generally, participants had been inspired to make change as a result of attending the workshop. However, they reported feeling thwarted by systemic issues such as their relationship with the supervisor, the negative attitude of their supervisor or negative culture within their office, and a belief that the department resists change.

Participants then made suggestions as to what may have been more useful to either include in the workshop, or in running the workshop in general. Themes identified by the raters were:

• That managers and staff attend the burnout workshop together;
• That managers do the burnout course for themselves, for their own burnout issues;
• That a whole unit attend the workshop first and then look at treatment of the problem;
• That a facilitator should analyse the interactions between staff and their manager and give feedback;
• That the Burnout Prevention Workshop should be offered at different levels of training, and that the levels should be spaced out to give staff the opportunity to evaluate their progress in between;
• Managers to be given power for discretionary leave for workers who have been working hard/long hours;
• More holidays/8 weeks leave per year.

Participants of the workshop saw that, while the Burnout Prevention Workshop was useful, they believed that it was the systemic difficulties within offices and between supervisors and staff that were the endemic issues. Many comments
made by participants related to concerns about their relationship with their supervisor, involving either protective fears that as their supervisor was good, they too may burn out, or negative comments about poor supervisors and the effects that this had on staff.

Additionally, participants made suggestions related to the need for individual and organisational recognition of the effects of chronic ongoing stress. The first involved individuals reviewing their own burnout issues at regular intervals. The second was for the organisation and staff supervisors to generally increase the amount of annual leave as well as being able to provide discretionary periods of leave as tangible recognition for the workers that had been working hard in a stressful role.

12.2.3 Research Question 3

The final research question for Study 3 asked what suggestions the Treatment Group participants would make as to how best to ameliorate District Officer turnover within the Department of Community Services. Themes elicited covered three distinct areas:

a) issues in relation to training;
b) issues in relation to recruitment; and
c) organisational issues.

The first of these involved themes related to training:

- Training is inadequate/not based on reality/not useful – simplistic;
- Training does not address the reality of the job and tends to minimise the problems that workers face;
- Training should acknowledge prior learning;
• Training should be ongoing as part of a worker's career development, not just done as a 3 month block when a District Officer joins the Department;
• Increments should be tied to training, rather than competencies;
• Training should be given as a reward for time in the job;
• External training is too expensive/not able to be afforded by offices. Internal training is limited – in terms of what is offered/number of places;
• The Departmental structure sabotages training. Training is not seen as necessary by managers/the organisation;
• District Officers are too busy to do training.

Generally, participants were very critical of the training offered by the Department of Community Services. Themes tended to be negative, focusing on participants' perception of training as being simplistic, pitched too low for their educational levels, and not enough being offered in terms of career development and formal knowledge progression. In addition, they spoke of the organisational and job constraints that limited their ability to take up training opportunities if they were offered, leading them to feel that formal learning and ongoing career development was not valued or promoted by the Department of Community Services.

Thematic issues raised by participants related to the recruitment of new District Officers. They are listed below:
• Should use burnout information in recruitment in relation to who is susceptible to burnout;
• Need clarification of professional qualifications accepted when recruiting, rather than taking people from diverse educational backgrounds and experience;
• An Information Night should be provided for new District Officers before they join the Department;
• New recruits have high expectations of the job, and the reality is different;
• Suggestion not to train people for 12 months.

Participants believed that there were steps that the Department of Community Services could take that would assist in reducing the staff turnover rate from the outset. Suggestions included being far more specific in the recruitment of new District Officers. They proposed that a more rigorous definition of professional qualifications, experience and educational backgrounds should be specified so that only suitable applicants were interviewed, rather than a greater range of people who may not possess the skills needed, but who had some experience. They also proposed that the information as to who was susceptible to burnout should be utilised in the selection of candidates.

Conversely, the participants believed that further information should be given to applicants about the difficulties and realities associated with the job, suggesting an Information Evening as an appropriate forum for this. They recognised that while this may narrow the number of potential candidates for the positions, it would possibly increase the “fit” in terms of matching the applicant to the position. In desperation, one participant suggested not training new District Officers for 12 months so that the money utilised in training, only to have them leave within a year, was not wasted.

Finally, the participants made suggestions in relation to the organisation of the Department of Community Services. These were:
• The organisation needs to concentrate on existing staff, rather than recruiting new staff, which is expensive;
• Managers need to change issues around urgency versus importance;
• The Department needs to affirm people in their own skills;
• That District Officers need career progressions, and that career opportunities should be given to people so that staff with potential are kept rather than lost;
• That one manager can be responsible for their team experiencing burnout.

These themes summarised many of the comments that were made throughout the feedback session that comprised Study 3. Participants felt strongly that the organisation demonstrated few organisational caregiving patterns that were nurturing, and that generally the supervisor/staff relationships were similar to those described by Kahn (1993) as being either "reverse flow" or "barren" relationships. Interestingly, as one participant noted during the course of the workshop, staff were often reminiscent of the abused children and families that they serviced. Despite perceiving the organisation as being without nurture, staff still craved a higher level of demonstrated care by the Department that was ultimately never forthcoming.

12.3 The Use of Qualitative Research in Study 3

Qualitative research has more commonly been used in the Child Protection field in relation to the experience of the victims of abuse, rather than in gauging the experience of the worker. Despite this, it has been recommended by many as a scientifically sound research method (Gilgun, 1992; Wells and Freer, 1994), while others have also recommended that it should be used within an organisational context (Rushton & Nathan, 1996). Still others have specifically recommended that the strongest research is based on both qualitative and quantitative procedures, rather than just one or the other (Doueck et al, 1992). Studies 1, 2 and 3 have combined quantitative and qualitative research
procedures. The joint contribution of these studies will be reviewed in the next chapter.

12.4 Limitations of Study 3

One of the most significant limitations of Study 3 is the small sample size \((n=8)\). While the findings of the qualitative research and the themes that were identified were undoubtedly extremely interesting, it must be remembered that the sample included only just over half the participants of the Treatment Group and were a tiny proportion of the District Officers of the Department of Community Services. This means that the identified themes may not be totally representative of the original Treatment Group. Thus, the question must be asked as to what was the experience of the other half of the Treatment Group in Study 2.

A further limitation of Study 3 was that the focus group format did not allow individual responses to be identified for comparative analysis. While this would have been interesting, it was not thought to be practical within the context of this organisational research. Further research should be conducted in this area.

Perhaps the major limitation of this study was that quantitative measures were not used again at the time of Study 3. This means that it was not possible to determine whether the standardised measures utilised in Studies 1 and 2 were actually ineffective in measuring change. Alternately, it may have been that the further length of time following the workshop (4 months compared to 6 weeks) allowed workshop participants to make changes that could have been measured with the standardised measures, but just not at a point in time that
was so close to the workshop. It thus would have been useful to have surveyed the participants of Study 3 with both qualitative and quantitative measures. This would have determined whether the poor statistical results of Study 2 were related to the lack of robustness of the standardised measures, or related to the period of longitudinal analysis. As a corollary to this, no qualitative data were collected prior to Study 3 to be used as a comparison to the current data.

12.5 Theoretical Implications of Study 3

Overall, these results reflect the findings of Glisson and Hemmelgarn (1998) who found that organisational climate was the primary predictor of positive service outcomes and a significant predictor of service quality, compared to interagency coordination, which either had no effect, or only a negative one. They concluded that efforts to improve the public children's service systems should focus on creating positive organisational climates rather than on increasing interagency coordination.

While the current research did not examine issues related to interagency coordination, the overwhelming message conveyed was that the workers' psychological well-being and positive feelings about doing their job was strongly related to their perceptions of working within an organisation that valued and cared about them. What was significant from Study 3 was the hope expressed by the sample that the organisation would improve the role of District Officer in order for staff to be retained, rather than to burn out, and the thoughtful and constructive suggestions they made in relation to this. However, there was also a strong belief that the Department of Community Services currently did not value them as workers, and that this situation was
likely to continue with the organisation not making any changes that would assist them in their role.

From the perspective of providing useful, practical research within an organisational framework, it is suggested that the qualitative data and analysis provided by Study 3 made a significant contribution to the current research. While there are no doubt methodological limitations to all three studies, the value provided by conducting qualitative research in Study 3, allowing special insight into the District Officers' experience of Child Protection work and the organisational context that it occurs in, was considerable.
CHAPTER 13

General Conclusions

13.1 Reflections on the Research

The current research into the relationship between work environments, personal resources and professional burnout has both confirmed much of the previous research that has been carried out in this field and has also highlighted areas that still need further investigation.

The benefits of a combined quantitative and qualitative research design were similar to many of those reported in the literature (Dewe, 1992; Janz et al., 1995; Bennett et al., 1996; Gould et al., 1996). As with those studies, the benefits mainly consisted of providing additional information about the research questions being asked, and in this case gave insight into the experience of the Burnout Prevention Workshop participants when the validity of the standardised measures was questioned. The current overall design was similar to that of Gould et al. (1996), who conducted a two-phase research project designed to examine burnout in competitive junior tennis players. They used quantitative measures to identify those players who were the most burnt out, and then used qualitative interviews to gain further information about their burnout processes in order to make appropriate recommendations.

In this research, quantitative measures were used to determine prevalence of burnout within a given community and, additionally for pre and post test
measurement, to gauge the efficacy of a particular intervention. Qualitative analysis was then used to gain further information as to the experience of the burnout process for a group of District Officers and to gain additional information as to what else could ameliorate staff turnover among District Officers in general.

This research also replicates the design of Hugentobler et al. (1992). In their study examining the relationship between occupational stress, psychosocial buffers and health outcomes, they found that the combination of qualitative and quantitative research techniques increased confidence in their research findings and strengthened the process and outcome of needs assessments, programme planning, implementation and evaluation. They noted that their dual approach was particularly useful in identifying and understanding problem areas and in developing and evaluating appropriate health education interventions.

The design process of this combined qualitative and quantitative research was similar to that experienced by Dewe (1992). He found that the use of a combined qualitative and quantitative design model was superior in giving information, particularly when he found that the coping checklist that he was using was not a robust measure. During the course of conducting this research, many questions have been raised about how robust/useful/accurate the standardised measures that were being used were, and whether they actually reflected what was being assessed. In this way, the qualitative analysis significantly added to the type and quality of the information that was being gleaned and served to confirm many of the doubts about the reliability of the measures that were raised from the results of the statistical analyses in Studies 1 and 2. Advantages of this research design included:
a) initial indications through the quantitative data of the prevalence and levels of burnout in District Officers in the Metropolitan North Division of the Department of Community Services;  
b) the understanding from the qualitative results of Study 3 that participants of the Burnout Prevention Workshop felt that they had benefited from the Workshop despite the lack of change in the pre and post test quantitative measures of Study 2;  
c) the qualitative data of Study 3 indicating that Supervisor Support is a critical factor in the burnout process – which was queried in the initial results of Study 1, and was not truly able to be identified from the quantitative data in Studies 1 and 2;  
d) specific identification, through the qualitative data of Study 3, as to the types of changes the Department of Community Services would need to make to reduce staff turnover in District Officers.  

The increased awareness by course participants of burnout issues following the intervention replicates the finding of Stevens and Pfost (1983). They found that after three problem solving sessions, staff who worked with terminally ill patients were far more aware of the burnout process and made greater efforts to apply problem solving techniques in their workplace. This had the further effect of leading to more productive and effective team meetings.

The number of statements made by participants in relation to the organisation’s significant contribution to their experience of burnout, reflects the recent propositions by Maslach and Leiter (1997). Bryan (1980) cites Rose Kapolozvnski of the Colorado Open Space Council in recognising that the interplay between the organisation and individual is critical to the burnout process and that the
organisation must recognise its responsibility to assist its employees. The present findings suggest that this is the case for the Department of Community Services:

"It seems that as an organization, as a movement, we have let our people come to the breaking point before providing them with any help with burnout. This help, when it arrives, is often in the form of vacations. Vacations usually relieve burnout, but we must start providing our people with protection from burnout, rather than just relieving it once it's present.

I think one of the most important ways of preventing burnout is to set clearly defined, realistic goals for the organization and for ourselves as individuals. This means having measurable and achievable expectations of what we can do. We all have limits, and I think we can avoid a lot of frustration if we recognize them at the beginning." (Bryan, 1980, p. 17)

The interplay between the individual's coping resources and their work environment has been the subject of this research. The increased awareness by Treatment Group participants around their own burnout issues reportedly empowered them to recognise when their expectations were not being met by their job. Given the current rate of staff turnover within the Department of Community Services, the question remains as to who is suited for working as a District Officer within the Department of Community Services. Further information about the realities of the job, as suggested by participants of Study 3, may assist in the selection of appropriate candidates for the position of District Officer. This may also assist applicants in determining whether the position is going to be acceptable to them prior to commencing the job. Clearly, these are issues beyond the scope of this research.
13.2 Theoretical Implications

Theoretical implications that can be drawn from this research programme include:

a) the benefits of using a combined quantitative and qualitative research design. This programme has demonstrated that the use of both types of methodologies has definite advantages over using either a pure quantitative or qualitative research design alone. This combined approach was useful in that it provided a comprehensive examination of burnout at both a statistical and individual level. The quantitative data provided statistical information in relation to correlates and predictors of burnout. Additionally, the qualitative data allowed a greater insight into the workers' experience of burnout while also contributing a clearer view of the results obtained in Studies 1 and 2.

b) the need for future research with Child Protection workers to also have a combined qualitative and quantitative design. Anecdotal evidence from the workshop participants indicated that there had been an element of "faking good" in their responses to the initial questionnaire in Study 2 (quantitative data). This issue was only revealed through the qualitative data however, emphasising the importance of the combined methodological design.

c) The recognition from the qualitative data that often the questions that researchers ask are not the ones that participants see as being vital to the research issue. The tangential responses to the questions posed in Study 3 highlighted the fact that the participants had specific points that they wanted to make about staff turnover in the Department of Community Services and specific solutions to assist in reducing it. It was only through a qualitative design that this was able to be recognised and acknowledged.
13.3 **Limitations of the Research**

There were some limitations to the current research which have been detailed throughout this work. The primary issues involve the relatively small sample sizes utilised in each of the studies. Study 1 comprised a proportion of District Officers who were only from the Metropolitan North region of the Department of Community Services and were therefore not representative of the greater context of District Officers, many of whom come from rural areas. It is possible that country District Officers face different inherent stressors in their working environments than do urban District Officers (e.g.; lack of external resources, distance issues etc.) and including them in the sample may have changed the overall results. Studies 2 and 3 also had relatively small sample sizes, with the qualitative data in Study 3 being drawn from a particularly small group (n=8). Also limiting, was the inability to include managerial staff within the research. Releasing supervisory staff for research is obviously a costly exercise, however in light of the current findings, may well have been of benefit. However, conducting research of this nature is difficult, particularly as it is dependent upon the goodwill and cooperation of others.

A further limitation was the difficulty in assessing the effects of seventeen different work environments on one sample without being able to control for the differences between centres. This difficulty plagued the current research and should be noted when planning further research.
13.4 Future Research

The benefits of conducting any research are the multitude of questions that arise while the research is in progress. Further research issues include:

a) the need for more qualitative research to confirm or discount the findings of Study 3. This needs to be conducted with a larger sample than was used in this research so as to gain a greater understanding as to what the Department of Community Services needs to do to retain its' District officers;

b) the need to conduct pre and post test analyses over a greater period of time than was used in Study 2, using a combined qualitative and quantitative design. This would serve to determine whether the quantitative measures used were ineffective in measuring personal and professional change for individuals participating in the workshop, or whether the longitudinal period needs to be extended to accurately measure the changes that occur;

c) what the other 43% of the Treatment Group of Study 2 felt about the Burnout Prevention Workshop. This would include their views on what happened for them, and to examine whether or not they agreed with the other participants of Study 3 in relation to the process of burnout in District Officers and how the organisation needs to provide for them.

Future research would benefit from exploring the burnout levels of managers and supervisors within the Department of Community Services. Anecdotal evidence from the District Officers indicated that they found it difficult to approach their supervisors as they saw them as being just as needy, overworked and stretched as they were. In addition, if they perceived their supervisors as being positive or supportive people, they generally did not want to further burden them in case they
left the organisation. Conversely, many reported negative relationships with their supervisors whom they saw as being punitive or neglectful of them. In these cases they felt that their supervisor actively contributed to their burnout experience.

13.5 Professional Implications of the Research

This research indicates many areas where intervention could occur by the Department of Community Services to ameliorate burnout in Child Protection workers. As noted by participants of the workshop, a Burnout Prevention Workshop, while being helpful, is only one of the interventions required and many of these interventions need to occur at an organisational, rather than a personal level. It is hoped that the Department of Community Services will adopt many of the suggestions made in this research at a practice level. Several important points were raised by the District Officers in Study 3. These included:

a) the need for the Department of Community Services not only to recognise, but acknowledge the stressful nature of Child Protection work and to train and treat their staff accordingly;

b) the need to incorporate training about burnout issues into the initial and ongoing training programmes for District Officers;

c) the need for further leave (including discretionay leave) to assist District Officers in dealing with the type of work that they do;

d) the need to revise the type of training offered to District Officers, including advanced training and career progressions for more experienced District Officers;

e) the need for relationships between supervisors and staff to be more accountable, so that staff are less likely to burn out.
Given the above findings, the following recommendations would be made to the Department of Community Services;

a) to redesign the role of District Officer, including;
   i) incorporating 10 days discretionary leave into the structure of the position – which could then be utilised at the discretion of the Assistant Manager as needed, when it was perceived that the District Officer had been under stress or working particularly hard;
   ii) clarifying the exact academic and work experience requirements needed for the position of District Officer so that there is some uniformity across generic entry workers;
   iii) pay increments to be competency/skill based and linked to further training, rather than based upon another year in the position;
   iv) career progressions to be made clearer, including:
      - types of professional skills needed to progress to Assistant Manager or Child Protection Specialist level (academic base, experience in the job, knowledge of conceptual models in relation to child abuse and domestic violence issues);
      - types of managerial skills needed to progress to Assistant Manager level (ability to supervise other workers, appropriate educational/academic base, conflict resolution skills etc.);
      - managerial skills to be developed and requisite before District Officers allowed to “Act Up” in Assistant Manager positions, rather than appointments on an ad hoc or convenience basis;

b) increasing the amount of “In House” training offered to District Officers throughout their careers, rather than just at entry level;

c) formalising the amount of training that District Officers must take per year in order to qualify for consideration of their pay increment;
d) incorporating the burnout prevention training into the DOCAP and annual training for District Officers;

e) redesigning the role of Assistant Managers to include:

- annual review of staff satisfaction and inbuilt review of each unit;
- formalisation of exact academic, professional and managerial requirements necessary to qualify for the position;
- budgetary allowance to facilitate team building exercises;
- performance indicators that include retention of staff and progression towards developing each workers potential;
- pay increments to be performance/skill based, rather than annual based;
- ongoing training in management and supervision skills to be undertaken annually.

In making these recommendations, there is an implicit expectation that an appropriately qualified person (e.g.: an organisational psychologist or occupational health psychologist) would be contracted to oversee these revisions, who would also build in strategies and methods of measuring whether or not the changes are effective in reducing staff burnout. Empirical evaluation, both of a quantitative and qualitative nature should be part of this process and will be crucial in determining whether or not the revisions assist in increasing worker satisfaction and retention, thereby reducing staff burnout.
13.6 Conclusions

The ultimate aim of this research was to provide an intervention that would assist in ameliorating staff burnout. It was recognised from the outset that there would be limitations to its efficacy, as there were financial, structural and time limitations just as there are for many pieces of research. The aim was to identify whether the characteristics and coping mechanisms of the individual or the working environment that they existed in were more significant in the burnout process, or, as it was proposed, whether it was the interplay between the two that led to individuals burning out.

As suggested, the preliminary research identified that it was the interplay between the individual and their work environment that best predicted burnout. The Burnout Prevention Workshop was targeted at assisting staff in the management of their burnout issues, as it was recognised that addressing the organisational issues was beyond the scope of the research. As such, it was appreciated that the ability to effect permanent change for workers would be limited.

Despite this, staff attending the workshop reported having greater awareness of burnout issues and of their need to look after themselves, rather than expecting the organisation to meet all their needs. Interestingly, four out of the original fourteen participants of Study 2 changed position within the four months following the workshop. Recommendations from participants of the workshop included many proposed organisational changes. It would seem wise, given the ongoing high staff turnover, for the Department of Community Services to heed these and investigate some of these issues further. These systemic recommendations,
however, do not detract from the usefulness of the Burnout Prevention Workshop as an intervention at the individual level. As one of the participants noted:

DO3: "There has to be the recognition I think, that it doesn't necessarily matter what you do as far as training, recruiting, whatever, the nature of the work that we do, the very nature of it, we're not going to change it because there are kids who are being abused, and we're going to have to deal with that, and I think that recognising that and validating people's feelings, that it's OK sometimes to feel like you're at your wits end, it's OK sometimes to not have the answer, you know, it's OK to have a break sometimes. And if that is developed as part of our job, the fact is, the quality of staff will just increase. Like I don't think that because our results show that our group, you know, the Treatment group got worse, I don't think that that means that we have become worse, I think that it means that we have become better, at what we do, because we can look after ourselves. We can say "Hey there's a problem here, let's try and work at it" and if we can't that's OK, it's not just me, and that sort of stuff. And that's going to have to raise the quality of work, and the quality of staff."

It is hoped that this research will contribute to the knowledge base that will assist Child Protection workers in continuing to do what they do well, without the enormous personal, financial and social costs of burnout.
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Thank you for agreeing to participate in the following survey. This survey aims to examine the variables which affect our attitude towards our work environments in the child protection field. It is being used in a research project being carried out at the University of Wollongong. The research has been approved by their Ethics Committee and is a key requirement in the Master of Arts (Honours) in Clinical Psychology.

The survey consists of three questionnaires, which should take about 20 minutes in all to complete. Most of the questions are answered by circling or ticking the appropriate answer, or filling in a number.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Lucy Blunt on (02) 977 6011 or the Secretary of the University of Wollongong Human Experimentation Ethics Committee. Should you wish to know the results of this research, please contact Lucy Blunt early in 1994. Should you agree to participate in the study, please complete the consent form below.

Thank you very much for your time and co-operation.

CONSENT FORM
I hereby give my consent for the information given in response to these questionnaires to be used as data to be analysed for study purposes. Consent is to be given on the basis that all information is to be regarded as totally confidential and anonymity is assured. I also understand that I am free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Please tick here if you consent: ___________ Date: ___________
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This information is requested so that it is possible to compare a cross-section of people and to see if any particular factors make a difference as to how we perceive our working environments. Please answer all questions.

1. Your sex (please tick):
   (1) Female _________     (2) Male _________

2. Your age in years: _________

3. What kind of area do you live in?
   (1) Metropolitan _________     (2) Country _________

4. What is your religion?
   (1) Protestant _________     (2) Roman Catholic _________
   (3) Jewish _________     (4) Other _________
   (5) None, no religion _________

5. Marital Status:
   (1) Single _________     (2) Married _________
   (3) Divorced _________     (4) Widowed _________
   (5) De facto _________     (6) Other (specify) _________

6. If married, for how long have you been married to your current spouse? _________ years

7. If you have children, how many of them are now living with you?
   (1) I have ____ children, and ____ are currently living with me.
   (2) I have no children _________

8. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   (1) completed high school _________
   (2) some tertiary _________
   (3) completed tertiary _________
   (4) some post-graduate work or degree _________
   (5) completed post-graduate degree _________
9. Please tick the discipline that you have studied in if you have tertiary qualifications:
   (1) Diploma in Welfare Studies ______
   (2) Bachelor of Arts ______
   (3) Bachelor of Science ______
   (4) Bachelor of Psychology ______
   (5) Bachelor of Social Work ______
   (6) Other (specify) ______

10. Are you employed part-time or full-time?
    (1) Part-time ______
    (2) Full-time ______

11. How long have you been employed in your current position? (please indicate either number of years or number of months)
    (1) ______ years
    (2) ______ months

12. How long have you been employed in the child protection area? (either number of years or months)
    (1) ______ years
    (2) ______ months

13. Which Community Service Centre do you work in? ___________________________ This information is for the purposes of research only.

    THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION
WORK ENVIRONMENT SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

There are forty statements listed below. They are statements about the place in which you work. The statements are intended to apply to all work environments. However, some words may not be quite suitable for your work environment. For example, the term supervisor is meant to refer to the boss, manager, department head, or the person or persons to whom an employee reports.

You are to decide which statements are true of your work environment and which are false. If you think the statement is true or mostly true of your work environment, circle the "T". If you think the statement is false or mostly false of your work environment, circle the "F".

Please be sure to answer every statement.

1. The work is really challenging. T F
2. People go out of their way to help a new employee feel comfortable T F
3. Supervisors tend to talk down to their employees T F
4. Few employees have any important responsibilities T F
5. People pay a lot of attention to getting work done T F
6. There is constant pressure to keep working T F
7. Things are sometimes pretty disorganized T F
8. There's a strict emphasis on following policies and regulations T F
9. Doing things in a different way is valued T F
10. It sometimes gets too hot T F
11. There's not much group spirit T F
12. The atmosphere is somewhat impersonal T F
13. Supervisors usually compliment an employee who does something well T F
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Employees have a great deal of freedom to do as they like</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There's a lot of time wasted because of inefficiencies</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. There always seems to be an urgency about everything</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Activities are well-planned</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. People can wear wild looking clothing while on the job if they want</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. New and different ideas are always being tried out</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The lighting is extremely good</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. A lot of people seem to be just putting in time</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. People take a personal interest in each other</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Supervisors tend to discourage criticisms from employees</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Employees are encouraged to make their own decisions</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Things rarely get &quot;put off till tomorrow&quot;</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. People cannot afford to relax</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Rules and regulations are somewhat vague and ambiguous</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. People are expected to follow set rules in doing their work</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. This place would be one of the first to try out a new idea</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Work space is awfully crowded</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. People seem to take pride in the organization</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Employees rarely do things together after work</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Supervisors usually give full credit to ideas contributed by employees</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. People can use their own initiative to do things</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. This is a highly efficient work-oriented place</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Nobody works too hard</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. The responsibilities of supervisors are clearly defined</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Supervisors keep a rather close watch on employees</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Variety and change are not particularly important</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. This place has a stylish and modern appearance</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONALITY FACTORS

INSTRUCTIONS

For each of the sixty statements that follow, circle the number that represents the rating that best describes you in the last six months. For each statement mark one of the following descriptions:

- Never or rarely = 1
- Sometimes = 2
- Often = 3
- Always or almost always = 4

It is important that you try to answer every question.

Never or rarely = 1, Sometimes = 2, Often = 3, Always or almost always = 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have plenty of energy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I say what I need or want without making excuses or dropping hints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am comfortable with the number of friends I have</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I eat junk food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel as worthwhile as anyone else</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am happy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am comfortable talking to strangers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am part of a group, other than my family, that cares about me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I accept the mysteries of life and death</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I see myself as lovable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I actively look for the positive side of people and situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I exercise vigorously 3-4 times a week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I accept compliments easily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I show others when I care about them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I believe that people are willing to have me talk about my feelings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I can show it when I am sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I am aware of my good qualities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I express my feelings to close friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I can make sense out of my world</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My weight is within 5lbs. (2kgs) of what it should be</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I believe in a power greater than myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I actively pursue happiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I can tell other people when I am hurt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I encourage others to talk about their feelings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I like my body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I initiate contact with people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I confide in my friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I can cry when sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I want to be of service to others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I can say what I want without putting others down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I accept problems that I cannot change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I know what is important in life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I admit when I'm afraid of something</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I enjoy being with people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I am tired</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I express my feelings clearly and directly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Certain traditions play an important part in my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I express my feelings of joy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I can identify my emotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I attend church or religious meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I do stretching exercises</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I eat well-balanced meals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I pray or meditate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I accept my feelings of anger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I seek to grow spiritually</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I can express my feelings of anger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>My values and beliefs help me to meet daily challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>I put myself down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I get along well with others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I snack between meals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I take time to reflect on my life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Other people like me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I laugh wholeheartedly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I am optimistic about my future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I get enough sleep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>My emotional life is stable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I feel that no one cares about me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I am shy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>I am in good physical shape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HUMAN SERVICES SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to discover how various persons in the human services or helping professions view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely. Because persons in a wide variety of occupations will answer this survey, it uses the term recipients to refer to the people for whom you provide your service, care, treatment, or instruction. When answering this survey please think of these people as recipients of the service you provide, even though you may use another term in your work.

Below, there are 22 statements of job-related feelings. 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) before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. An example is shown below.

Example:

HOW OFTEN: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Never A few Once a A few Once a A few Every
times a month times a week times a week
yr / less month month week

HOW OFTEN
0-6 Statement:

I feel depressed at work

If you never feel depressed at work, you would write the number "0" (zero) under the heading "HOW OFTEN". If you rarely feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would write the number "1". If your feelings of depression are fairly frequent (a few times a week, but not daily) you would write a "5".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A few times a yr/less</td>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Every day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW OFTEN 0-6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. ________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EE: ________  
DP: ________  
PA: ________
SUBSCALE ITEMS FOR EACH OF THE MEASURES

Questionnaire 1

MODIFIED WORK ENVIRONMENT SCALE - MODIFIED WES: Moos, 1986

Involvement - Items: 1, 11, 21, 31
Peer Cohesion - Items: 2, 12, 22, 32
Supervisor Support - Items: 3, 13, 23, 33
Autonomy - Items: 4, 14, 24, 34
Task Orientation - Items: 5, 15, 25, 35
Work Pressure - Items: 6, 16, 26, 36
Clarity - Items: 7, 17, 27, 37
Control - Items: 8, 18, 28, 38
Innovation - Items: 9, 19, 29, 39
Comfort - Items: 10, 20, 30, 40

PERSONALITY FACTORS (COPING RESOURCES INVENTORY) - CRI:
Hammer & Matting, 1988

Cognitive Resources - Items: 3, 6, 11, 12, 14, 18, 23, 49, 55
Social Resources - Items: 4, 8, 9, 15, 25, 27, 28, 30, 35, 50, 53, 58, 59
Emotional Resources - Items: 2, 7, 16, 17, 19, 24, 29, 31, 34, 37, 39, 40, 45, 47, 54, 57
Spiritual/Philosophical Resources - Items: 10, 20, 22, 32, 33, 38, 41, 44, 46, 48, 52
Physical Resources - Items: 1, 5, 13, 21, 26, 36, 42, 43, 51, 56, 60

HUMAN SERVICES SURVEY - MBI: Maslach & Jackson, 1986

Emotional Exhaustion - Items: 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 16, 20
Depersonalisation - Items: 5, 10, 11, 15, 22
Personal Accomplishment - Items: 4, 7, 9, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21
APPENDIX B: Cover Letter of Study 1 Questionnaire

RESEARCH ON STAFF TURN-OVER

I am a psychologist, based at Manly CSC, and am currently in my third year part-time of a Master of Arts (Honours) in Clinical Psychology at the University of Wollongong. As part of this course, I am required to produce a thesis, based upon research that I have carried out.

The department calculated in 1990 that the average length of stay for a new District Officer was 11 months, and that the cost of their three month training course was $20,000. This meant that after training, their actual time in the field was reduced to 8 months.

My research aims to look at the amount of stress that each District Officer is experiencing, and to look at how this interacts with their own personal coping mechanisms and their working environment, being the individual Community Service Centres. I am preferring to look at each CSC individually, rather than the Department as a whole, because I think that most people would agree that each of the CSC's vary enormously both in their physical and social environments.

The results that I will be interested in will be interactive, as I am looking at a causal model of stress. This means that I am looking at why some people experience more stress than others in a particular working environment, what is it about the environment that makes it stressful, and what coping mechanisms do people employ so that they can cope best with each environment.

I realise that I have asked for a lot of personal information in the questionnaires, and I can only assure you that this is personal research, which has been approved by, but has not been funded or commissioned by the department. Your participation is totally voluntary, but would be very much appreciated in order to make my statistics valid. For these reasons, I have included my home address and a stamped self-addressed envelope. Your responses will be totally confidential and your anonymity is assured. The personal information that I have requested is to make comparisons between other studies which have been carried out in America and England.

This research has been approved to be carried out in the Metropolitan North division of the department, covering seventeen Community Service Centres. This means that approximately 205 District Officers will be given the questionnaire, and I am hoping that with a good response rate, we will be able to draw some valid conclusions. At the conclusion of the study, I will be returning to each CSC to give feedback on the results of the research.

Should you decide to participate in the study, then I would appreciate it if you could complete and return the questionnaire as soon as possible so that I can begin to analyse the data (it also stops it hanging around your desks). Please do not hesitate to contact me, either at work on (02) 977 6011, or at home on (02) 904 1545.

Thank you very much,

Lucy Blunt
Dear D.O.,

**HAVE YOU FORGOTTEN ABOUT ME?**
*(Remember the questionnaire?)*

Thank you to the 63 of you out of the 167 that it has been given to so far, who have returned the questionnaires on staff turn-over. However, I am now in a position to start analysing the statistics.

SO...

If there is anyone out there who at this moment is thinking that they *really were* going to get around to filling in that yellow envelope that has been hanging around...

THEN...

if you could complete and return it to me by Friday 17th September (at the very latest), that would be wonderful.

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

Lucy Blunt
AND THE RESEARCH CONTINUES...

BURNOUT PREVENTION WORKSHOP

Calling for all volunteers!! This workshop continues research undertaken in 1993, by Lucy Blunt, Psychologist, Manly CSC, which examined staff turnover in Child Protection workers in the Metropolitan North Division. Having examined the nature of burnout within the Division, I am now interested in developing and evaluating an intervention aimed at reducing staff burnout. This will be a voluntary, interactive workshop, which will hopefully have some positive outcomes. Staff will be required to complete two questionnaires at separate times as part of the study.

AIM: To develop an understanding of the burnout process, and to assist staff, through a specifically designed intervention.

WHERE: Staff Development & Training Unit
Kamballa
1 Fleet Street
North Parramatta

WHEN: 4 day workshop
Mon./Tues - 3rd/4th July and...
Mon./Tues - 17th/18th July
9.15am - 4.30pm (9am registration)

COURSE PRESENTER: Lucy Blunt

If you would like to participate in the study, but are not available to attend the workshop, I am also seeking volunteers to complete the two questionnaires separately as part of the research design. This is a very important aspect of the research, and as it is not the most exciting thing to do, I will really need some kind and lovely people (both male and female) to help me out.

NOMINATIONS: For Workshop: By staff development nomination form
For Questionnaires: Please return attached sheet

Anonymity and confidentiality will be an important part of this study.
Yes!! I am a kind and lovely person who is willing to participate in the research on Staff turnover. I understand that I am undertaking to complete two questionnaires with an 8 week interval between them. I also understand that this research will maintain my anonymity and confidentiality, with none of my data being able to be linked to me as an individual. I also understand that this is a voluntary study, and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without penalty.

NAME: ____________________________

CENTRE: __________________________

Please return this sheet to:
   Lucy Blunt
   Clinical Psychologist
   DCS Manly CSC
   4-10 Sydney Road.
   Manly  2095

/or if you would prefer, to my home address:
   4/15 Samora Avenue,
   Cremorne,
   NSW  2090
Thank you for agreeing to participate in the following survey. This survey aims to examine the variables which affect our attitude towards our work environments in the child protection field. It is being used in a research project being carried out at the University of Wollongong, supervised by Dr. Patrick Heaven. The research has been approved by their Ethics Committee and is a key requirement for the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology.

The survey consists of four scales and background data, which should take about 20 minutes in all to complete. Most of the questions are answered by circling or ticking the appropriate answer, or by filling in a number.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Lucy Blunt on (02) 977 6011. If you have any enquiries regarding the conduct of the research please contact the Secretary of the University of Wollongong Human Experimentation Ethics Committee on (042) 213 079. Should you wish to know the results of this research, please contact Lucy Blunt. Feedback will also be provided to staff upon completion of the study. If you would like to participate in the study, please complete the consent form below.

Thank you very much for your time and co-operation.

**CONSENT FORM**

I hereby give my consent for the information given in response to this questionnaire to be used as data to be analysed for study purposes. I understand that the data collected will be used to further research into the study of staff turnover in District Officers, and I consent for the data to be used in this manner. Consent is given on the basis that all information is to be regarded as totally confidential and anonymity is assured. I also understand that I am free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Please tick here if you consent: ________ Date: _________

CG/PRE-TEST
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This information is requested so that it is possible to compare a cross-section of people and to see if any particular factors make a difference as to how we perceive our working environments. Please answer all questions.

1. Your sex (please tick):
   (1) Female ________
   (2) Male ________

2. Your age in years:
   (1) 20-24 years _____
   (2) 25-29 years _____
   (3) 30-34 years _____
   (4) 35-39 years _____
   (5) 40-44 years _____
   (6) 45-49 years _____
   (7) 50-54 years _____
   (8) 55-59 years _____
   (9) 60-64 years _____
   (10) 65+ years _____

3. What kind of area do you live in?
   (1) Metropolitan ______
   (2) Country ________

4. What is your religion?
   (1) Protestant _______
   (2) Roman Catholic ______
   (3) Jewish ___________
   (4) Other ____________
   (5) None, no religion ______

5. Marital Status:
   (1) Single ___________
   (2) Married _________
   (3) Divorced __________
   (4) Widowed __________
   (5) De facto __________
   (6) Other (specify) ______

6. If married, for how long have you been married to your current spouse?
   (1) < 1 year _______
   (2) 1-5 years _______
   (3) 6-9 years _______
   (4) 10-14 years _______
   (5) 15-19 years _______
   (6) 20+ years _______
   (7) Not Applicable ______

7. If you have children, how many of them are now living with you?
   (1) I have ____ children, and
   (2) I have ____ children currently living with me.
   (3) I have no children ______
8. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
   (1) completed high school ______
   (2) some tertiary ______
   (3) completed tertiary ______
   (4) some post-graduate work or degree ______
   (5) completed post-graduate degree ______

9. Please tick the discipline that you have studied in if you have tertiary qualifications:
   (1) Welfare Studies ______
   (2) Arts ______
   (3) Science ______
   (4) Psychology ______
   (5) Social Work ______
   (6) Other (specify) ______
   (7) Not Applicable ______

10. Are you employed part-time or full-time?
    (1) Part-time ______
    (2) Full-time ______

11. How long have you been employed in the child protection area? (please indicate either number of years or number of months)
    (1) _____ years       or       (2) _____ months

12. How long have you been employed in your current position? (either number of years or months)
    (1) _____ years       or       (2) _____ months

13. In order for the research to track your data over both questionnaires, but to maintain your anonymity as an individual, please give:
Your mother’s maiden name: ________________
Her date of birth: ______/_______ (year is not necessary)

   - THANK YOU FOR YOUR CO-OPERATION
WORK ENVIRONMENT SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS

There are forty five statements listed below. They are statements about the place in which you work. The statements are intended to apply to all work environments. However, some words may not be quite suitable for your work environment. For example, the term supervisor is meant to refer to the boss, manager, department head, or the person or persons to whom an employee reports.

You are to decide which statements are true of your work environment and which are false. If you think the statement is true or mostly true of your work environment, circle the "T". If you think the statement is false or mostly false of your work environment, circle the "F".

Please be sure to answer every statement.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The work is really challenging.</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisors tend to talk down to their employees</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People pay a lot of attention to getting work done</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There is constant pressure to keep working</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Doing things in a different way is valued</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There's not much group spirit</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supervisors usually compliment an employee who does something well</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There's a lot of time wasted because of inefficiencies</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There always seems to be an urgency about everything</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. New and different ideas are always being tried out</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A lot of people seem to be just putting in time</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supervisors tend to discourage criticisms from employees</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Things rarely get &quot;put off till tomorrow&quot;</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. People cannot afford to relax</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. This place would be one of the first to try out a new idea</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. People seem to take pride in the organization</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Supervisors usually give full credit to ideas contributed by employees T

18. This is a highly efficient work-oriented place T

19. Nobody works too hard T

20. Variety and change are not particularly important T

21. People put quite a lot of effort into what they do T

22. Supervisors often criticise employees over minor things T

23. Getting a lot of work done is important to people T

24. There is no time pressure T

25. The same methods have been used for quite a long time T

26. Few people ever volunteer T

27. Employees generally feel free to ask for a raise T

28. There's an emphasis on "work before play" T

29. It is very hard to keep up with your work load T

30. New approaches to things are rarely tried T

31. It is quite a lively place T

32. Supervisors expect far too much from employees T

33. Employees work very hard T

34. You can take it easy and still get your work done T

35. Things tend to stay just about the same T

36. It's hard to get people to do any extra work T

37. Employees discuss their personal problems with supervisors T

38. People seem to be quite inefficient T

39. There are always deadlines to be met T

40. There is a fresh, novel atmosphere about the place T

41. The work is usually very interesting T

42. Supervisors really stand up for their people T

43. There's a tendency for people to come to work late T

44. People often have to work overtime to get their work done T

45. Things always seem to be changing T
PERSONALITY FACTORS

INSTRUCTIONS

For each of the twenty two statements that follow, circle the number that represents the rating that best describes you in the last six months. For each statement mark one of the following descriptions:
- Never or rarely = 1
- Sometimes = 2
- Often = 3
- Always or almost always = 4

It is important that you try to answer every question.

*Never or rarely =1, Sometimes = 2, Often =3, Always or almost always = 4*

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I like myself

I am comfortable with the number of friends I have

I feel as worthwhile as anyone else

I am comfortable talking to strangers

I am part of a group, other than my family, that cares about me

I see myself as lovable

I actively look for the positive side of people and situations

I accept compliments easily

I show others when I care about them

I am aware of my good qualities

I actively pursue happiness

I encourage others to talk about their feelings

I initiate contact with people

I confide in my friends

I want to be of service to others
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. I put myself down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I get along well with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Other people like me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am optimistic about my future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I feel that no one cares about me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am shy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HUMAN SERVICES SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to discover how various persons in the human services or helping professions view their jobs and the people with whom they work closely. Because persons in a wide variety of occupations will answer this survey, it uses the term recipients to refer to the people for whom you provide your service, care, treatment, or instruction. When answering this survey please think of these people as recipients of the service you provide, even though you may use another term in your work.

Below, there are 22 statements of job-related feelings. 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) before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. An example is shown below.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a day</td>
<td>Every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yr / less</td>
<td>or less</td>
<td>month</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>month</td>
<td>week</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW OFTEN

0-6

Statement:

I feel depressed at work

If you never feel depressed at work, you would write the number "0" (zero) under the heading "HOW OFTEN". If you rarely feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would write the number "1". If your feelings of depression are fairly frequent (a few times a week, but not daily) you would write a "5".
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW OFTEN:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A few times a yr/ less</td>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Every day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOW OFTEN 0-6**

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

EE: _____ _____  
DP: _____ _____  
PA: _____ _____
ATTRIBUTIONAL STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS

Read each situation and vividly imagine it happening to you. Decide what you believe would be the one major cause of the situation if it happened to you. Write this cause in the blank provided. Answer three questions about the cause by circling one number per question. Do not circle the words. Go on to the next situation.

SITUATIONS

YOU MEET A FRIEND WHO COMPLIMENTS YOU ON YOUR APPEARANCE:

1) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________

2) Is the cause of your friend's compliment due to something about you or something about other people's circumstances?
   - Totally due to other people or circumstances

3) In the future when you are with your friend, will this cause again be present?
   - Will never again be present

4) Is the cause something that just affects interacting with friends, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
   - Influences just this particular situation

YOU HAVE BEEN LOOKING FOR A JOB UNSUCCESSFULLY FOR SOME TIME:

5) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________

6) Is the cause of your unsuccessful job search due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?
   - Totally due to other people or circumstances

7) In the future when you look for a job, will this cause again be present?
   - Will never again be present

8) Is the cause something that just influences looking for a job, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
   - Influences just this particular situation
YOU BECOME VERY RICH:

9) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________________________

10) Is the cause of your becoming rich due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally due to other</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Totally due to me people or circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11) In your financial future, will this cause again be present?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will never again be present</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Will always be present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12) Is the cause something that just affects obtaining money, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences just this particular situation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Influences all situations in my life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A FRIEND COMES TO YOU WITH A PROBLEM AND YOU DON'T TRY TO HELP HIM/HER

13) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________________________

14) Is the cause of your not helping your friend due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally due to other</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Totally due to me people or circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15) In the future when a friend comes to you with a problem, will this cause again be present?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will never again be present</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Will always be present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16) Is the cause something that just affects what happens when a friend comes to you with a problem, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences just this particular situation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Influences all situations in my life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

YOU GIVE AN IMPORTANT TALK IN FRONT OF A GROUP AND THE AUDIENCE REACTS NEGATIVELY:

17) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________________________

18) Is the cause of the audience's negative reaction due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally due to other</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Totally due to me people or circumstances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
19) In the future when you give talks, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Will always be present

20) Is the cause something that just influences giving talks, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just this particular situation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Influences all situations in my life

YOU DO A PROJECT WHICH IS HIGHLY PRaised:

21) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________

22) Is the cause of your being praised due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstances 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally due to me

23) In the future when you do a project, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Will always be present

24) Is the cause something that just affects doing projects, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just this particular situation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Influences all situations in my life

YOU MEET A FRIEND WHO ACTS HOSTILELY TOWARDS YOU:

25) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________

26) Is the cause of your friend acting hostile due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstances 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally due to me

27) In the future when interacting with friends, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Will always be present

28) Is the cause something that just influences interacting with friends, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just this particular situation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Influences all situations in my life

YOU CAN'T GET ALL THE WORK DONE THAT OTHERS EXPECT OF YOU:

29) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________
30) Is the cause of your not getting the work done due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstances

31) In the future when doing work that others expect, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present

32) Is the cause something that just affects doing work that others expect of you, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just this particular situation

33) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________

34) Is the cause of your unsuccessful job search due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstances

35) In the future when you look for a job, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present

36) Is the cause something that just influences looking for a job, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influences just this particular situation

37) Write down the one major cause: ____________________________

38) Is the cause of your getting the position due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstances

39) In the future when you apply for a position, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present
SUBSCALE ITEMS FOR EACH OF THE MEASURES

Questionnaire 2

WORK ENVIRONMENT SCALE – WES: Moos, 1986
Involvement – Items: 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36, 41
Supervisor Support – Items: 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37, 42
Task Orientation – Items: 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 33, 38, 43
Work Pressure – Items: 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39, 44
Innovation – Items: 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45

PERSONALITY FACTORS (COPING RESOURCES INVENTORY)- CRI:
Hammer & Marting, 1988
Cognitive Resources – Items: 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 19
Social Resources – Items: 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21

HUMAN SERVICES SURVEY – MBI:Maslach & Jackson, 1986
Emotional Exhaustion – Items: 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 16, 20
Depersonalisation – Items: 5, 10, 11, 15, 22
Personal Accomplishment – Items: 4, 7, 9, 12, 17, 18, 19, 21

ATTRIBUTIONAL STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE – ASQ: Peterson, Semmel, Von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky & Seligman, 1982
Composite Positive – Items: 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 22, 23, 24, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 46, 47, 48
Composite Negative – Items: 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 42, 43, 44
June 1st, 1995

Dear

Thank you very much for volunteering to participate in the Burnout Prevention Workshop. This is just a quick note to acknowledge receipt of your nomination form, and to confirm your place in the workshop. Please let me know in advance if the situation changes and you are unable to attend. I can be contacted at Manly CSC on 977 6011, or at home on 904 1545.

Look forward to seeing you there!!

Many thanks,

Lucy Blunt
June 1st, 1995

Dear

Thank you very much for volunteering to be part of the research on Staff turnover. This is just a quick note to say that I will be sending out the questionnaires at the beginning of July - so watch your pigeonhole around then!

Many thanks,

Lucy Blunt
June 28, 1995

Assistant Community Managers
Met. North Division

Dear ACM,

I am enclosing a last call for volunteers flyer for the Burnout Prevention Workshop, which is starting next week at Kamballa, and is aimed at DO's.

Please could you display this somewhere prominent (ie movements board or a notice board) so that any final volunteers are aware.

Thank you very much,

Lucy Blunt
Clinical Psychologist
Manly CSC

URGENT
FINAL CALL FOR VOLUNTEERS...

BURNOUT PREVENTION WORKSHOP

There is still space in the Burnout Prevention Workshop, for anyone who is interested. If you would like to participate in this research, by either attending the workshop, or filling in the questionnaires, please contact Lucy Blunt at Manly CSC on (02) 977 6011. All nominations must be received by Friday, 30th June, 1995.

Look forward to hearing from you!!
BURNOUT PREVENTION WORKSHOP

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Duration: 4 Days - 2 x 2 days, with a fortnight between

Developed By: Lucy Blunt

Target Group: District Officers

Pre-requisites: None

Rationale: The increasing cost of training District Officers, and the amount of staff turnover currently occurring, indicates that burnout is a significant problem for the Department.

Aims: To assist workers in identifying and reducing their experience of burnout.

Workshop Objectives: At the end of the workshop participants will be able to:

1. Identify the three features that comprise burnout
2. Identify the significant predictors of burnout
3. Recognise their own triggers of burnout and the factors that contribute to it
4. Formulate an individual goal plan which will assist them in reducing their experience of burnout

Accommodation Requirements: The venue must accommodate around 20 people comfortably - including the opportunity for small group
work. The room set up should be in a U-shape, with the ability to see all overhead material.

Training Methods: The workshop uses a variety of learning experiences which maximise participation, and different styles of intaking information. These include short “lecturettes”, problem solving in small groups, and the use of video as a discussion point.

Group Size: The group should be no larger than 18 to allow for division into small groups with reasonable report back times.

Training Resources:

- Overhead Projector
- Whiteboard/markers
- Butcher paper/flip chart
- TV/video
DAY 1
SESSION 1.1 INTRODUCTION AND WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

TIME: 9:15 am - 10:30 am

OBJECTIVES:
- Introduce the course, its purpose and content
- Introduce the participants to each other
- Clarify participants expectations and fears

INTRODUCTION TO COURSE
Welcome participants to burnout course, discuss who I am, and that we are going to be together for four days. Emphasise the confidential nature of the group, and ask them not to discuss it with anyone. - 5 mins

QUESTIONNAIRE
Explain that this is a research study. Ask them to fill in the questionnaire before we start. - 20 mins

HOUSEKEEPING
Introduce them to the handout material. Explain that it will be given out on a daily basis, and that it summarises the overheads and handouts. The workbook is theirs to keep and write in. Talk about timing, and the importance of both parties keeping to the time limits. State that the break times are the times for picking up messages and returning calls. Set break time for 10:30 am. Say that before starting, would like to clarify what other people’s expectations are of the course. - 5 mins

WARM UP EXERCISE
Ask participants to turn to the person on their right and interview them briefly so that they might introduce them to the group. Ask them to state, following the introduction of the other person, why they personally have come to the workshop and what they would like to gain from it. - 30 mins

FEEDBACK
As participants introduce each other, write their
expectations on the flip chart. State as to whether all of these needs can be met, and if not, how they can be met (i.e.: research articles distributed, or information to be given later. - 5 mins

OVERVIEW OF THE PRESENTATION

Rationale for research - cost of training D.O.’s, staff attrition rate, stress leave increasing, PSA and parliamentary issue, consideration of lack of further funding from the GIO for stress leave. - 10 mins

Where the four days are going - cover definition, who is more likely to burnout, research undertaken, predictors of burnout, personal charting, making a personal plan, show brief sketch of course outline - O/H - Burnout Prevention Workshop Timetable (4 day). - 5 mins
SESSION 1.2 SIGNS, SYMPTOMS AND INDICATORS

TIME
11:00 am - 1:00 pm

OBJECTIVES
• Introduce the definition of burnout, and rationale for the research
• Determine participants level of experienced burnout
• Discuss participants experience of burnout/burnout situations
• Introduce the correlates of burnout
• Discuss particular aspects of child protection work that make the job stressful
• Identify personal risk factors associated with burnout, for both men and women

DEFINITION OF BURNOUT
What is burnout? - 5 mins
Petty Bureaucrat - O/H 1.2: 1, overview/introduction to the workshop. Introduce definition of burnout, discuss all three aspects of the burnout process - O/H 1.2: 2.
Story of Stan - O/H 1.2: 3, explain that it is most severe case. - 5 mins

PERSONAL CHARTING
Direct participants to the Personal Charting questionnaire in their handout manual. Instruct them to fill in the questionnaire, and score it for their own information. Ask them to reflect on the questionnaire and what it means to them. - 15 mins

VIDEO
Introduce the video on burnout from the "Improving Service Series". Only use the first half of the video, identifying the causes and behaviours associated with burnout. Stop the video before it moves towards changes that can be made. - 10 mins

DISCUSSION
Ask participants to reflect on the video, and what they may have identified with. Discuss issues that may arise
from the video - 10 mins

**BURNOUT**

**DEFINITION**

Present O/H 1.2: 4 - Burnout Definition. State that this is what burnout is comprised of. Present O/H 1.2:5 - Emotional Exhaustion. Note that this is the key aspect of the burnout syndrome. Present O/H 1.2: 6 - Depersonalisation. Present O/H 1.2: 7 - Personal Accomplishment, note that this aspect is inversely related to the other two aspects of the syndrome. - 15 mins

**CORRELATES WITH BURNOUT**

Present O/H 1.2: 8 - Correlates with Burnout. Explain that this list is not exhaustive. Ask participants if they can identify any further correlates that they have noticed. Record these on a white board. 5 mins

**CHILD PROTECTION**

Present O/H 1.2: 9 - Encourage participants to develop reasons as to why child protection work is stressful. List these ideas on a flip chart. - 5 mins

**PROFILE OF THE CHARRED**

Present O/H’s 1.2: 10 - 1.2:1.2: 17 - Profile of the Charred. Promote discussion about the sex differences and the age theories. See if the group agrees or does not agree with these theories, and ask them to explain why. Discuss why being married with children would reduce burnout. - 30 mins

Promote discussion on new workers being idealistic and wanting to “save the world”, without understanding the limitations and restrictions of the organisation. Use a white board, dividing it in half, with the headings, Fantasy versus Reality. - 10 mins

**RECAP**

Recap important points. Write them on a flip chart. - 5 mins.
SESSION 1.3: ORGANISATIONAL CAREGIVING

TIME
2:00 pm - 3:30 pm

OBJECTIVES
- Introduce the concept of organisational caregiving
- Identify patterns of organisational caregiving
- Identify organisational patterns that promote burnout
- Create a picture of the organisation and its caregiving patterns

ORGANISATIONAL CAREGIVING
Present O/H's 1.3: 1 and 1.3: 2 - Introduce the concept of organisational caregiving, and the eight dimensions of caregiving. Ask participants to contribute the impact that they believe that the behavioural dimensions of caregiving would produce. - 15 mins


Work though O/H 1.3: 8 - Patterns of Organisational Caregiving, and then present O/H 1.3: 9. Ask participants to make a flow diagram of their levels between their team and their management hierarchy, and to identify the type of patterns that exist between the levels. - 20 mins

Ask participants to share their patterns. Present O/H 1.3 10. Generate a discussion about Organisational Caregiving, and the constraints of care. - 30 mins

RECAP
Recap important points. Put them on a flip chart. 5 mins
SESSION 1.4: RESEARCH ON STAFF TURNOVER

TIME
4:00 pm - 4:30 pm

OBJECTIVES
- Inform participants of previous research
- Outline the aim of the research and the methods
- Inform them of the findings of the research
- Clarify that the most significant predictor of burnout was the cognitive resources of the individual
- Ensure that a transfer of learning has occurred
- Encourage evaluation and questioning of ideas by participants

RESEARCH ON STAFF TURNOVER
Present O/H 1.4: 1 - Describe the previous study.
Present O/H 1.4: 2 - An Interactive Model of Burnout. Describe the results and findings. Present O/H 1.4: 3 - A Predictive Model of Burnout. Describe how the results led to implications for the workshop and development of the intervention. - 15 mins

- State clearly that the Cognitive Resources of the individual were the single biggest predictor of burnout across all three aspects of the process

QUIZ
Distribute “Quiz - Day 1” and ask participants to complete it. - 5 mins

Distribute brief evaluation sheets, with comments to encourage them to share ways of improvement for the course, for the presenter. State that they are welcome to write down further questions that they would like answered during the next few days. - 5 mins

Score the Day 1 Quiz. Reward the highest scorer. Reward the most significant verbal contributor for the day. - 5 mins. Collect evaluation forms
DAY 2
SESSION 2.1: DEBRIEFING AND COGNITIVE RESOURCES

TIME
9:15 am - 10:30 am

OBJECTIVES
- Clarify any unresolved issues
- Introduce topics for today
- Introduce the notion that the individual has the greatest power of all
- Introduce the concept of Coping Resources
- Introduce the concept of Cognitive Resources
- Encourage participants to begin cognitive reframing, and to utilise this throughout the workshop
- Introduce the notion of learned helplessness

DEBRIEFING
Give feedback on evaluation forms. Follow up any issues raised. Ask participants for any further questions that they may have. Clarify any problems or queries raised yesterday. - 5 mins

Present O/H of Timetable for Day 2. - 5 mins

COPING RESOURCES
Present O/H's 2.1: 1 and 2.1: 2 - Coping resources. Discuss with the group what sort of resources they currently utilise. Use the white board to record these. Have the group clarify whether they generally use escape coping or control coping. - 15 mins

COGNITIVE RESOURCES
Present O/H 2.1: 3 - Give the definition of cognitive resources. Explain again that this was the single best predictor of all three aspects of burnout. Explore participants reactions to the notion that they have the greatest control over their experience of burnout. Explore negative reactions to this point within the
COGNITIVE REFRAMING

Discuss the idea of restructuring cognitive processes to make them bearable. Encourage participants to begin practising this technique throughout the workshop. State that you will be rewarding them for positive cognitions throughout the workshop.

Have them practise on the following statements:
“`I can’t handle these situations. I’m no good at them.``”
“`If I don’t stay here and do this, it just won’t get done.``”
“`I mucked that project up so noone will ever trust me again.``”
“`I’m just too busy to even think about that now.``”
“`I’m really stressed. I’m so tired, I just can’t cope.``”
“`My boss is such a lousy supervisor. I never know what she expects.``”
“`He is so inconsiderate of me.``”

Tell them to remind you of their positive statements if you forget. Reward them with small chocolates when they utilise cognitive restructuring. - 10 mins

LEARNED HELPLESSNESS

Present O/H 2.1: 4 - Learned Helplessness. - 5 mins

Have them read the handout on “Learned Helplessness: A Scientific Study”. Ask participants to share experiences where they felt this same sense of frustration and hopelessness, and how the situation was resolved. - 20 mins

Present O/H 2.1: 5 - Change Distress to Eustress. Ask them to think about what they would do differently if the situation happened again, or else to reframe the situation to perceive it differently now. Reinforce the idea that when the situation changes, they must again
seek an escape exit. Remind them that sometimes we stop looking for the exit. Reinforce the idea of cognitive restructuring/reframing.

Recognise that sometimes there are situations that don't and cannot be changed. Encourage ideas and different ways of looking at the situation that could help people deal with this eventuality. Remind them that even when the situation is unchangeable, that we can think laterally and develop new coping resources to deal with external limitations. - 10 mins

Present O/H 2.1: 6 - Orientation Towards Life. Discuss the differences between a pessimistic and an optimistic explanatory style. Discuss the difference between a planned problem-focused style, and an emotion focused style. Present O/H 2.1: 7 - The Optimist Creed - 5 mins

CARRYING FRUSTRATIONS WITH YOU

Present O/H 2.1: 8 - The Muddy Road: A Zen Story. Remind people of the power of negative thoughts. Do a quick group exercise where they think of an unpleasant situation for 60 seconds. Ask them to notice what happens to their mood, and what physical sensations they experience. Then have them recall a pleasant situation, and have them reflect on the emotional and physical sensations that they experience. Remind them that if they carry negative feelings and a negative approach, that they will be likely to recreate negative feelings, both mentally and physically. - 10 mins

RECAP

Recap important points. Write them on a flip chart. - 5 mins
SESSION 2.2: SOCIAL RESOURCES AND SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

TIME

11:00 am - 1:00 pm

OBJECTIVES

- Introduce concept of Social Resources
- Identify current social networks
- Clarify the importance of the role of the supervisor
- Identify what makes a good and a bad supervisor
- Identify how they can use their supervisor as a support

SOCIAL RESOURCES

Present O/H 2.2: 1 - Social Resources. Discuss importance of social resources. Present O/H 2.2: 2 - Peer Support. Present O/H 2.2: 3 - Spouse and Family Support. Refer back to burnout profile, in relation to marriage and children being buffers to burnout. - 10 mins

Discuss differences in men's and women's uses of social support, and the importance of social support for women in the workplace. - 5 mins

EXISTING SOCIAL NETWORKS

Refer to handout of Social Support Networks. Have the group use the circular measure to identify the range and breadth of their current social network. - 10 mins

Facilitate a discussion on which support groups participants find most useful in buffering their stress eg; family, hobby/interest groups etc. - 10 mins

BUILDING SOCIAL SUPPORT NETWORKS

Have participants read “Social Resources” in their manual. Then have them fill in the sheet “Make a Plan for Building Social support.” - 20 mins
IMPORTANCE OF SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

Present O/H’s 2.2: 4 and 2.2: 5 - Supervisor Support. Identify and explain what makes a good and a bad supervisor. Encourage discussion and feedback with the group about how their supervisor can affect their feelings of burnout. - 5 mins

SUPERVISION

Present O/H 2.2: 6 - Supervision. Clarify that this is what the supervisor is meant to facilitate.

GOOD/BAD SUPERVISOR

Divide the white board into two sections, with Good Supervisor and Bad Supervisor listed at the top. List what makes a good and a bad supervisor underneath these. Reflect to the group that there are probably different ways that we respond to different types of supervisors. Mention that most people probably risk more, seek clarification for decision-making and approval for casework from a good supervisor, and that they risk less, and work out beforehand what is possible and what is not from a bad supervisor. - 10 mins

POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES OF THE WORKPLACES

Encourage discussion about the positive and the negative aspects about people’s supervisors. Elicit from the group techniques that have worked with their supervisors to meet their needs. - 10 mins

Discuss the need for workers to recognise cues indicating support, and encourage them to engage in support seeking behaviours. - 5 mins
HOW TO GET THE
MOST OUT OF YOUR
SUPERVISOR/

BRAINSTORMING  Break into small groups of 4, that don’t represent workplace mixes. Ask these groups to discuss ways/strategies that they can get the most out of their supervisors. - 15 mins

Have the groups nominate a spokesperson, and then have them feed back to the plenary to get an overall list of ideas. Record these on the flip chart. - 25 mins

GETTING FEEDBACK  Have participants fill in the sheet “Getting Feedback”. Discuss how important it is to make action plans about what we can do to ensure that we don’t feel helpless. - 10 mins

RECAP  Recap important points. Write them on a flip chart. - 5 mins
SESSION 2.3: THE PERSONAL PLAN

TIME
2:00 pm - 3:30 pm

OBJECTIVES
• introduce the notion of the personal plan
• devise an individual plan for each participant
• ensure that the plans are realistic

IMPORTANCE OF PERSONAL PLANS
Open the session with O/H 2.3: 1. Explain the nature of personal plans. - 5 mins

POSITIVE CHANGES
Have participants read the handout on “Making Positive Changes”. - 10 mins
Then ask them to fill in the sheet “Things That I Would Like To Change”. - 10 mins

BRAINSTORMING NEW IDEAS
Have the group break into small groups of four. Get them to share the things that they would like to change. Have them identify - what sort of issues exist in their workplaces, what traditionally causes them stress, what they may need help with problem-solving from their colleagues. - 20 mins

FEEDBACK TO THE GROUP
Have each individual briefly feed back to the group. Group responses into common themes on a flip chart. Compile a list of “Tricky Issues” at the same time on the white board. Then use the group to help problem-solve these issues. - 25 mins

CHARTING THE PERSONAL PLAN FOR ACTING ON
Have each individual set their own goals and action plan for the next two weeks, on the sheet “This Fortnight’s Objectives Worksheet.” Circulate through the group to
make sure that they complete a plan, and assist with any difficulties. Each plan should contain a time frame, and readily achievable goals. Tell people that you will be contacting them during the two week break to catch up on how the plan is going, and to see if anything should be incorporated into the next two days of workshop. - 15 mins

**BEING REALISTIC**

Have participants read the sheet "Being Realistic". Ask them to reevaluate their goals, and check that they meet the criteria. - 5 mins

**STRESS MONITORING**

Introduce the stress monitoring charts. Explain the necessity of filling them in daily for the next two weeks. Reinforce the necessity for cognitive restructuring. - 5 mins

**STRESSFUL EVENTS LOG**

Introduce the "Stressful Events Log". Explain that it should be filled in whenever the participant is feeling very stressed, or when a stressful incident occurs. Explain that this will be used for charting their stress patterns to see if there are any particular situations which can be dealt with differently in the future. - 5 mins
SECTION 2.4: SUMMARISING AND THE QUIZ

TIME

4:00 pm - 4:30 pm

OBJECTIVES

• Ensure that a transfer of learning has occurred
• Encourage evaluation and questioning of ideas by participants

QUIZ

Distribute “Quiz - Day 2” and ask participants to complete it. - 10 mins

Distribute brief evaluation sheets, with comments to encourage them to share ways of improvement for the course, for the presenter. State that they are welcome to write down further questions that they would like answered during the next few days. - 5 mins

Score the Day 2 Quiz. Reward the highest scorer. Reward the most significant verbal contributor for the day. - 15 mins

Collect evaluation forms
DAY 3
DAY 3

SESSION 3.1: DEBRIEFING

TIME
9:15 am - 10:30 am

OBJECTIVES
- Obtain feedback on participants experience of enacting their personal plans
- Clarify what worked and what did not
- Obtain a sense of what could be done differently next time
- Chart individual’s personal stress patterns
- Reinforce previous learning from last sessions

ICE BREAKER
Ask if anyone can remember everyone’s name after the break. Reward the highest scorer. - 5 mins (9:20)

EVALUATION
FEEDBACK
Give feedback from the last day’s evaluation sheets.
State what is possible and what is not. - 5 mins (9:25)

NEW IDEAS FROM LAST SESSION
Ask if anyone has any further comments or ideas from the last session. - 5 mins (9:30)

DEBRIEFING THE PERSONAL PLAN
Generate a discussion on participants experience of enacting their personal plans. Highlight what went well, and what proved to be obstacles. - 15 mins (9:45)

Then ask them to fill in the worksheet “Personal Stress Graph”, using their Personal Stress Charts for the two week period as the data. - 10 mins (9:55)

Then ask them to fill in the worksheet “Personal Stress Patterns”. Ask them to reflect on whether there were any significant periods that indicate when a particular
time is almost guaranteed to be stressful. Ask them if there is anything that they can do to guard against these periods, or make them less stressful. - 15 mins (10:10)

RECAP

Recap important points. Explain that the power of negative thinking is a difficult issue to combat. Ask participants to read the sheet “Develop an I-Can-Do Attitude”, and then fill in the worksheet “Exercise in Powerful Thinking”. - 15 mins (10:25)

Ask participants what they find hard about combating negative thinking. - 5 mins (10:30)
SESSION 3.2: TRICKY ISSUES & INVOLVEMENT

TIME
11:00 am - 1:00 pm

OBJECTIVES
- Brainstorm difficult issues identified by participants
- Introduce concept of involvement
- Clarify what individuals can do to enhance their commitment
- Clarify what individuals can do to stay committed, but not burnout

TRICKY ISSUES
Explain that the group is going to break into small groups of four in order to brainstorm the “Tricky Issues” identified in the last session. Tell them that they will have 15 mins to fill in the “Tricky Issues” worksheet, as a group, and that they should then use this technique to think about the “Other Tricky Issues to Ponder On” if they get an opportunity. - 20 mins (11:20)

Have the groups feed back to the plenary. As they feed back, write key points on the white board. Once they have covered the main issue, then ask them to use the same technique for the other issues. Remind them that they can jot down the points in their handbooks. - 25 mins (11:45)

DEFINITION
Present O/H 3.2: 1 - Involvement. Give definition of involvement. Discuss the nature of involvement and commitment being a double edged sword to workers, that the more committed they are, the more likely they are to burnout. Encourage discussion around this area. - 10 mins (11:55)

WHAT DOES INVOLVEMENT REPRESENT?
Generate a discussion with workers about what involvement and commitment represents. Ask them what their boundaries and cut off points. Divide the
white board into two sections. Label one, "Commitment is...", label the other "Commitment is too much when...". Ask the group to participate in filling in the sections. - 15 mins (12:10)

ENHANCING PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT AND TEAMINESS

Divide the group into small groups of 4. Ask each group to evaluate their own workplaces, and work out whether there is too much or too little commitment. Ask them then to evaluate themselves and their own personal commitment. - 5 mins (12:15)

Request that while in their groups of four, that they fill in the sheet "Enhancing Personal Involvement & Teaminess". Have them generate safeguards (when a person should recognise that they are overinvolved), stopgaps (strategies that they should use to pull back from the job) and personal enhancers (increasing level of personal commitment to the job). These groups may also like to develop things that their teams can do to increase team commitment to the work. Remind them of the need for positive cognitions. - 15 mins (12:30)

Have the groups nominate a spokesperson and feed their ideas back to the plenary. - 20 mins (12:50)

RECAP

Recap important points. Write them on a flip chart. - 5 mins. (12:55)
SESSION 3.3: WORK PRESSURE

TIME 2:00 pm - 3:30 pm

OBJECTIVES
• Introduce concept of work pressure
• Define self-monitoring strategies
• Develop a sense of control over a work pressured environment
• Enhance assertiveness to resist external pressures

DEFINITION
Present the O/H 3.3: 1 - Work Pressure. State that work pressure is related to Emotional Exhaustion. Explain that work pressure is not so much about particular tasks being done, as it is about the general feeling of pressure within the workplace, and possibly working on an emergency or crisis basis. - 5 mins (2:05)

SELF-MONITORING
Divide the white board into two sections. Head one section “What Work Pressure Means to Me.” Head the other side, “How I Recognise When I am under Pressure.” Record their responses on the white board. - 10 mins (2:15)

Discuss the issue that Human Service Professionals are often the worst at recognising when they are overloaded. State that they often recognise overload in others, but have difficult in recognising it in themselves. Brainstorm ideas as to how they can develop strategies for recognising when they are overloaded, eg; case counting, keeping a chart of stress levels, number of times in a week they have kicked the dog. Record these on the flip chart. - 10 mins (2:25)

CONTROLLING THE SENSE OF URGENCY IN THE ENVIRONMENT
Generate a discussion on what participants do to control the sense of urgency within their environments. Ask them what they do in order to stay calm and make the
best casework practice decisions. - 10 mins (2:35)

LEARNING TO SAY

NO

Write “When is overload, overload?” on the white board. Ask the group to discuss the question. - 10 mins (2:45)

Ask the group for ideas as to how they can say “no” when they feel overloaded, and not feel guilty about it. - 10 mins (2:55)

Ask for volunteers to role play a situation where the workers felt overloaded and were requested to do an unnecessary task. Ask participants to volunteer a situation which they felt that they did not handle well, and ask them to brief the rest of the group as to the scenario and their reaction. - 10 mins (3:05)

Role play this with another participant acting as their supervisor. Do not use the person who gave the scenario as a volunteer. Ask the group to give comments on what could have been handled differently, and their feelings about the role play. Ask the volunteers to talk about how they felt in their roles, and where the sense of power was. Debrief the players afterwards. - 25 mins (3:30)

RECAP

Recap important points. Write them on a flip chart. - 5 mins. (3:35)
SESSION 3.4: SUMMARISING AND THE QUIZ

TIME
4:00 pm - 4:30 pm

OBJECTIVES
• Ensure that a transfer of learning has occurred
• Encourage evaluation and questioning of ideas by participants

QUIZ
Distribute “Quiz - Day 3” and ask participants to complete it. - 10 mins (4:10)

Distribute brief evaluation sheets, with comments to encourage them to share ways of improvement for the course, for the presenter. State that they are welcome to write down further questions that they would like answered during the next few days. - 5 mins (4:15)

Score the Day 3 Quiz. Reward the highest scorer. Reward the most significant verbal contributor for the day. - 15 mins (4:30)

Collect evaluation forms
DAY 4
SESSION 4.1: QUESTION TIME AND TASK ORIENTATION

TIME
9:15 am - 10:30 am

OBJECTIVES
- clarify any unresolved issues
- introduce the concept of task orientation
- clarify participants expectations of themselves
- clarify participants expectations of their work places
- introduce time management principles

QUESTIONS
Ask participants if they have any burning unanswered questions. Restate these and answer them where possible. - 5 mins (9:20)

RECAP
Go through evaluation forms from Day 3 and recap important points. Clarify any queries. Present Timetable of where we are heading today. - 10 mins (9:30)

TASK ORIENTATION
Present O/H 4.1: 1 - Task Orientation. Explain how the degree of emphasis on Task Orientation in the work place can dominate the work. State that high Task Orientation is linked to depersonalisation, and that this is when the emphasis on fulfilling the criteria is more important than the casework. Clarify that Task Orientation is different to Work Pressure in that Task Orientation is about getting particular jobs or tasks done, rather than a more global feeling of work pressure. - 5 mins (9:35)

Present O/H 4.1: 2. Ask participants to discuss when they have felt that the emphasis on task orientation has worked to their detriment. Include a discussion on how it can also work to the detriment of casework. Ask
participants the question "When don't statistics matter?"
Record their answers on a flip chart. - 15 mins (9:50)

Using the white board, head it “What does experience
Teach us? - Where is the balance?” Have participants
Recognise that there is a need for task orientation to be
In any environment, but encourage them to discuss
Solutions, about where the balance between these issues
Might be. Record their answers on the white board.
Then ask them to reflect on the kind of expectations that
We should have of our supervisors to achieve this
Balance. Go back and delineate responsibility between
The individual or the supervisor on the responses
Recorded on the white board. - 20 mins (10:10)

TIME MANAGEMENT Have participants read the sheet “Principles of Time
Management”. Generate a discussion on what works
For others in terms of getting work done and being
Work focused, but not being dominated by having to
Meet certain criteria. Ask if splitting administrative and
casework helps, having specific days for specific tasks.
Record ideas as they are developed on a flip chart. - 15
mins (10:25)

RECAP Recap important points. Write them on a flip chart. - 5
mins (10:30)
SESSION 4.2: INNOVATION

TIME

11:00 am - 1:00 pm

OBJECTIVES

• Introduce the concept of innovation
• Examine the benefits of environmental stimulation
• Examine the benefits of professional growth
• Develop methods of combating apathy and engendering enthusiasm

INNOVATION

Present O/H 4.2: 1 - Innovation. Discuss the importance and benefits of environmental stimulation. - 5 mins (11:05)

Ask participants to discuss what they have found useful to increase their sense of innovation and environmental stimulation, and professional growth. Have them reflect on activities that they have participated in which have reenergised them. Write these down on the white board. - 10 mins (11:15)

Ask participants to discuss where the difficulties are for them to take on new projects, or have involvement outside their casework. Ensure that membership to committees, the spokeswoman’s programme, external conferences and any innovative ideas are explored. Reward extremely innovative ideas that are raised. - 10 mins (11:25)

Have participants fill in the worksheet “Transforming Barriers into Challenges”, and then discuss what participants found difficult. - 20 mins (11:45)

Then have them fill in the worksheet “Expand Your Job”. Ask people to volunteer their responses. Record these on the white board. - 20 mins (12:05)

Ask participants the question “Where could you go for
funding or approval?” Outline a hierarchical map that follows the line management line. Also mention that funding can be approved by specialist committees who have budgets for certain projects. - 10 mins (12:15)

BREAK
Break and stretch for 10 mins. - 10 mins (12:25)

BRAINSTORM
Ask people what they can do if the organisation does not provide for their professional development. Ask them to volunteer ideas that they and others could do, to keep them reenergised professionally. Record these on the flip chart. - 20 mins (12:45)

VIDEO
Play the last part of the Burnout Video from the “Improving Service Series”. Discuss that many of the aspects contained in the video we have already covered. - 10 mins (12:55)

RECAP
Recap important points. Write them on a flip chart. - 5 mins (1:00)
SESSION 4.3: THE FINAL PERSONAL PLAN

TIME

2:00 pm - 3:30 pm

OBJECTIVES

• Introduce the concept of balance
• Devise an individual action plan that will work
• Set time frames and limits
• Emphasise participants controlling their own processes

BALANCE

Present O/H 4.3: 1 - Conclusion. Discuss the importance of balance in our lives, and how when we lose perspective on the situation we lose balance. Ask participants how they have felt when they have been feeling burnt out, and if they thought that the balance was right in their lives at that time. - 15 mins (2:15)

THE ACTION PLAN THAT WILL WORK

Ask participants what they will be taking from the workshop that they will be able to implement, or that could affect their feelings of burnout. Have them recap the most significant points that they believe could be beneficial to themselves or others. - 20 mins (2:35)

Present O/H 4.3: 2 - The Final Personal Plan. - 5 mins (2:40)

Ask participants to fill in the sheet “The Final Personal Plan” in their handout book. Remind them to set time frames, set achievable goals, and to be aware of the limitations of their environments. Ask them to include their social networks in their personal plan. Have them frame their plan with positives, and not with negatives. Remind them to rework anything that was not successful last time. Circulate amongst the group to assist with any difficulties that they may experience. - 15 mins (2:55)
Then have them fill in the “One Month Objectives Worksheet” and the “One Year Objectives Worksheet”, with either the same or different information. Explain that this is a more in-depth contract. - 10 mins (3:05)

Ask participants to share some of their plans. Record these on the white board. Reflect on how much more empowered they are to take control of their environments, rather than just having to react to the environment. - 20 mins (3:25)

**QUICK FIX**

Present O/H 4.3: 3 - “Quick Fix” Checklist. Go through it, and suggest that people can use it for a quick review when they are feeling low. However, reinforce that it is no substitute for a realistic plan. - 5 mins (3:30)
SESSION 4.4: SUMMARISING AND THE QUIZ

TIME

4:00 pm - 4:30 pm

OBJECTIVES

• Ensure that a transfer of learning has occurred
• Encourage evaluation and questioning of ideas by participants
• Encourage constructive evaluation of the course.

QUIZ

Distribute “Quiz - Day 4” and ask participants to complete it. - 10 mins (4:10)

Distribute Day 4 and Course Evaluation sheets, with comments to encourage them to share ways of improvement for the course, and for the presenter. - 10 mins (4:20)

Score the Day 4 Quiz. Reward the highest scorer. Reward the most significant verbal contributor for the day. - 10 mins (4:30)

Thank all participants for their contributions and personal sharing during the course.

Collect evaluation forms

CLOSE
DAY 1

- OVERHEADS
Good morning. I’m glad you’re here. Help yourself to a cup of coffee. We’ll be starting at 9.15 am.

Please ensure that:

• You have registered
• You have a name tag
• You have a questionnaire to fill in

Feel free to fill in the questionnaire while you are waiting...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>DAY 1</th>
<th>DAY 2</th>
<th>DAY 3</th>
<th>DAY 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am -</td>
<td>Introduction &amp;</td>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Debriefing &amp; Questions</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>Coping Resources</td>
<td>Stress Patterns</td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am -</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm -</td>
<td>What is Burnout?</td>
<td>Social Resources</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm -</td>
<td>Personal Contributions</td>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm -</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm -</td>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Positive Changes &amp;</td>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm -</td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>The Personal Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Final Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm -</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm -</td>
<td>Research on Staff Turnover</td>
<td>Summarising &amp; The Quiz</td>
<td>Summarising &amp; The Quiz</td>
<td>Summarising &amp; The Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## BURNOUT PREVENTION WORKSHOP - DAY 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am - 10:30 am</td>
<td>Introduction and Welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am - 11:00 am</td>
<td>What is Burnout?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am - 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Personal Contributions to Burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm - 2:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm - 3:30 pm</td>
<td>Organisational Contributions to Burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm - 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Research on Staff Turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"For many of the helping professionals that we interviewed, one of the major signs of burn-out was the transformation of a person with creativity and commitment into a mechanical, petty bureaucrat who goes by the book."

(Maslach, 1978)
"Burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do "people work" of some kind. It is a response to the chronic emotional strain of dealing extensively with other human beings, particularly when they are troubled or having problems. Thus, it can be considered a type of job stress. Although it has the same deleterious effects as other stress responses, what is unique about burnout is that the stress arises from the social interaction between helper and recipient." p.3

..."The burnout syndrome appears to be a response to chronic everyday stress (rather than to occasional crises). The emotional pressure of working closely with people is a constant part of the daily job routine. What changes over time is one's tolerance for this continual stress, a tolerance that gradually wears away under the never-ending onslaught of the emotional tensions. As a result, when a caregiver begins to have problems in dealing with people, he or she has difficulty in identifying their situational cause. There is no immediate change in the work environment that corresponds with the noticeable change in his or her behavior...However, since the job is a constant factor, while the person's problems vary over time, the person is unable to see a situational cause that coincides with the effect." p.11

(Maslach, 1982)
THE STORY OF STAN

"I am a psychologist, going on my third year of employment as a therapist in a community mental health center. I have seen myself change from an avid, eager, open-minded, caring person to an extremely cynical, not-giving-a-damn individual in just two and a half years. I'm only 26, and I've already developed an ulcer from doing continuous work in crisis intervention. I've gone through drinking to relax enough to get to sleep, tranquillisers, stretching my sick leave to its ultimate limit, and so on. At this point, to get through the year, I've chosen to flip into the attitude of going to the mental health center as if it were working at GM, Delco or Frigidaire factories - that's what it has become here, a mental health factory! I am slowly, painfully beginning to realise that I need time away from constantly dealing with other people's sorrows, and that in order to head off the deadness that is beginning to happen inside of me, I must get away, apply for a month or so leave of absence, maybe more - when I start shaking just upon entering the office, then I know that's it. It hurts to feel like a failure as a therapist in terms of not being able to handle the pressure, but it's better that I do something about it now, rather than commit suicide later after letting it build up much longer."  
(Maslach, 1982)
# PERSONAL CHARTING

## Are You Burning Out?

Review your life over the last six months, both at work and away from work. Then read each of the following items and rate how often the symptom is true of you.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sometimes true</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel tired even when I’ve gotten adequate sleep.
2. I often feel dissatisfied.
3. I feel sad for no apparent reason.
4. I am forgetful.
5. I am irritable and snap at people
6. I am withdrawn
7. I have trouble sleeping
8. I get sick a lot
9. My attitude about work is “why bother”
10. I get into conflicts with others
11. My job performance is not up to par
12. I use alcohol and/or drugs to feel better
13. Communicating with others is a strain
14. I can’t concentrate like I once could
15. I am easily bored
16. I work hard but accomplish little
17. I feel frustrated
18. I don’t like going to work
19. Social activities are draining
20. Sex is not worth the effort

## Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 1987)
BURNOUT DEFINITION

- Staff are required to spend considerable time in intense involvement with other people

- Staff-client interaction is centred around the client’s current psychological, social, and/or physical problems - and therefore charged with feelings of anger, embarrassment, fear or despair

- Solutions to the problems are not obvious or easy - leads to ambiguity and frustration

- Burnout is comprised of three key factors:
  - Δ emotional exhaustion
  - Δ depersonalisation
  - Δ personal accomplishment (inversely related)

- Of these three, emotional exhaustion is the most significant contributor to the burnout experience
Emotional Exhaustion

- *feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one’s work*

- key aspect of the burnout syndrome

- As emotional resources are depleted, workers are no longer able to give of themselves at a psychological level

- pattern of emotional overload and subsequent emotional exhaustion

- staff feel drained and used up - lack enough energy to face another day

- emotional resources are depleted, and there is no source for replenishment
Depersonalisation

- *an unfeeling and impersonal response towards recipient's of one's service care, treatment or instruction*

- development of negative, cynical attitudes and feelings about one's clients

- viewing other people through "rust coloured glasses"

- developing a poor opinion of clients, expecting the worst from them, and even actively disliking them, viewing them as deserving of their troubles

- pigeon-hole people into various categories, and then respond to the category, rather than to the individual

- by applying a formula, rather than a unique response, staff avoid having to get to know the individual client and become emotionally involved

- staff attempt to cut back on involvement with clients - reduce contact with them to the minimum in order to get the job done

- depersonalisation increased in situations where the worker is directed by management - leads to feelings of detachment and distance from their clients
Personal Accomplishment

- feelings of competence and successful achievement in one’s work with people

- in burnout - the tendency to evaluate oneself negatively, particularly in relation to one’s work

- being down on others often leads to being down on oneself

- caregivers feel distress or guilt about the way in which they have thought about or mistreated others

- gnawing sense of inadequacy about their ability to relate to clients, leading to feelings of "failure"

- staff feel unhappy about themselves and dissatisfied with their accomplishments on the job

- sense that they are turning into a cold and uncaring person that they and others do not like

- possibility of over compensating for negative feelings by over-involvement with clients, or have unrealistic goals about their effectiveness on the job

- lack of self-esteem can lead to the belief that it is a personal problem, or a change to a job with less human contact
CORRELATES WITH BURNOUT

- poor physical health
- poor emotional health (eg; depression)
- insomnia
- substance abuse (increased use of alcohol, drugs, tranquillisers)
- marital/family problems
- work avoidance
- staff turnover
- intention to leave the job
- absenteeism
- tardiness
- taking long breaks
- difficulties in attending, concentrating
- difficulties with engaging in complex thinking/problem solving
- low morale
- neglect of duties
- serious mistakes
CHILD PROTECTION

- perhaps the most sensitive area of the human services
- public outrage when injury/death occurs
- yet accusations of "Gestapo tactics" by parents whose children have been removed
- parents claim overreaction and violation of parental rights
- daily confrontation of unmotivated families resenting workers efforts
- many roles of the worker - advocate, broker of services, case manager, therapist, and investigator - leading to potential for role conflict
- daily confrontations eg; destructive behaviour of a child, parents not following thorough, client suicide etc - represent incidents which are difficult to recover from in short periods of relaxation and recreation after work
PROFILE OF THE CHARRED

SEX DIFFERENCES

Women

• more likely to become emotionally exhausted - link to socialisation factors; women expected to be more caring, sensitive, nurturing and therefore more highly involved with clients

• decreased emotional support from supervisors and co-workers predictive of irritation, emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation

• role conflict between home and work significant for women

• more likely to report higher rates of psychological distress, including depression and depressive symptoms

• lack of support associated with greater likelihood to resort to avoidance coping strategies, if situation is unchangeable

• personal accomplishment associated with decreased client contact, greater likelihood of job comfort and less role ambiguity
Men

• more likely to be depersonalised

• predictors of burnout in men - tend to be more work-related; doubts about competence, problems with clients, lack of fulfilment

• more likely to be prone to severe physical illness

• emotional exhaustion related to increased amount of client contact

• depersonalisation related to a decreased likelihood of role ambiguity and increased client contact

• personal accomplishment associated with increased client contact and increased job challenge
Age

- younger people scored higher on emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation

- older people scored higher on personal accomplishment

- older people more likely to have survived the first few years and therefore stayed in the job

- relationship between higher age and greater problem-solving coping - greater reliance on planful, oriented approach with age

- younger people expressing greater job stress
Developmental

- more mature individuals able to organise their own environments

- less mature need the stabilising influence of a well-structured setting

- more experienced suffer less emotional exhaustion and depersonalisation

- experienced practitioners more likely to have developed effective coping mechanisms over time

- less experienced more likely to assume responsibility for "fixing the client" - leads to thoughts and feelings of incompetency and inadequacy when this does not work
Three Stages of Professional Development

- **Embryonic Professional** - lowest of three levels of professional development
  - major causes of disillusionment - problems with children and clients, no appreciation or support

- **Consolidated Learner** - consolidated maintenance of pedagogical theories and issues
  - major causes of disillusionment - frustrations with relationships and lack of environmental stimulation

- **Professionally maturing** - highest of three levels of professional growth in continuous process of professional development
  - major causes of disillusionment - frustrations with relationships and lack of environmental stimulation
Idealism of the New Worker

- poor orientation
- workload
- lack of stimulation/fulfilment
- social isolation
- doubts about competence
- problems with clients
- lack of collegiality
- limitations of the bureaucracy
- general conflict between ideals and reality
MARRIED...WITH CHILDREN

- married people less likely to burnout
- people with children less at risk
- believed to be related to extensive practical training in conflict resolution and problem solving
- aspects of social support to deal with stress
ROUGH PROFILE OF THE CHARRED

- typically single
- childless
- highly motivated
- have completed Uni, but not post-graduate
- self-defeating behaviours
- inability to say no
- resistance to self-examination
- tendency to over-schedule their time
- lack of attendance to personal needs
- excessive attempts to please others
- can be weak and unassertive with others
- submissive, anxious and fearful of involvement
- impatient and intolerant - easily angered/frustrated
- lacks self-confidence, little ambition
- reserved and conventional
- easily discouraged by difficulties
- high emotional investment in the job
- usually occurs between 1-5yrs on job
Caregiving

- essentially an emotional act, involving the transfer of emotions through exchanges of resources, time, information, counselling, or services. Essentially psychological, involving conscious as well as unconscious phenomena.
Eight Dimensions of Caregiving

- **accessibility** - remain in other’s vicinity, allowing time and space for contact and connection

- **inquiry** - ask for information necessary to provide for other’s emotional, physical, and cognitive needs; probe for other’s experiences, thoughts, and feelings

- **attention** - actively attend to other’s experiences, ideas, self-expressions; and show comprehension

- **validation** - communicate positive regard, respect, and appreciation to other

- **empathy** - imaginatively put self in other’s place and identify with other’s experiences

- **support** - offer information, feedback, insights, and protection

- **compassion** - show emotional presence by displaying warmth, affection, and kindness

- **consistency** - provide ongoing, steady stream of resources, compassion, and physical, emotional, cognitive presence for other

- interactions are woven together daily both for caregiving, and withholding care
characterised by caregiving flowing from agency superiors to subordinates during role-related interactions

those charged with directing, coaching, managing, and supervising others exhibit caregiving behaviours in the context of performing their tasks

hierarchical superiors consistently witness, support, and safeguard their subordinates roles, and in doing so, help replenish subordinates supplies of caregiving

superiors receive caregiving from subordinates as incidental, rather than as their due
Reverse Flow

- characterised by reverse caregiving in hierarchical relationships - agency subordinates give unreciprocated care to superiors

- classic pattern of caregiving in dysfunctional family systems - children becoming parents

- those charged with directing, coaching, managing and supervising others are ministered to by their nominal subordinates

- hierarchical subordinates consistently witness, support, and safeguard their superiors' roles, and in doing so, help replenish their superiors' supplies of caregiving, while draining their own
Fragmented

- characterised by a cycling of caregiving between a superior and subordinate who simultaneously replenish one another while withholding care from others for whom they are responsible

- caregiving is contained so tightly that it does not spill over into other parts of the organisation

- members wall themselves off leaving other subordinates bereft of caregiving flows

- the organisation is fragmented, split into those who receive care and those who do not

- pattern resembles dysfunctional families, groups, and organisations in which some members construct inappropriately rigid boundaries that leave them inside and outside sources of support
Self-Contained

- characterised by the temporary retreat of the subsystem members into mutual caregiving that occurs outside the hierarchical structure

- resembles peer support groups that caregivers form to offset job burnout and provide emotional and social support to one another that cannot be found elsewhere

- different in that here subsystem members form support systems because they are abandoned by those who can but do not provide caregiving

- resemble children in dysfunctional families who care for themselves after being abandoned emotionally by their parents

- after being denied appropriate caregiving by formal superiors, subordinates establish boundaries, separating them from other organisation members to temporarily halt the draining of their energies. The boundaries split the organisation and remove people from the hierarchical flow of caregiving - like the fragmented pattern

- in the self-contained pattern though, peer group members have little choice but to turn to one another for caregiving, however, they remain within, rather than abandon their roles as caregivers

1.3: 6
Barren

- characterised by a mutual lack of caregiving between hierarchical superiors and subordinates

- people withdraw emotionally from one another, creating relationships in which they are regularly disengaged, alienated, and emotionally absent rather than present

- they become locked into patterns of relating in which they are distant rather than intimate, involving: lack of warmth, inability to contribute to one another’s learning and growth, and an undermining of task collaboration

- mutual withdrawal leads to draining rather than replenishing supplies of caregiving of both superior and subordinate

- characterised by immobility, whereby hierarchical superiors and subordinates are unable to find the personal connections that allow collaborations to occur
Patterns of Organisational Caregiving

- organisational caregiving patterns derived from and maintained by different dimensions simultaneously

- importance of looking at how caregiving organisations replenish members emotional supplies used in caregiving tasks

- need for members with hierarchical responsibility to act from their roles to provide caregiving to subordinates

- as superiors represent the organisation to subordinates, when superiors give or withhold care, subordinates experience it as systemic as well as personal - this is similar to clients feeling cared for or withheld from by the organisation, depending on the relationship with the worker

- caregiving required is not simply interacting with members to replenish them, but preventing the draining of their emotional supplies

- to offset fragmentation, organisation members must find ways to reflect on their dysfunctional patterns and collaborate to weaken their pull. Must examine caregiving patterns in relation to one another and chart them
... ideally one would create a picture of the organisation that is shared by all and then worked on
ORGANISATIONAL PATTERNS OF CAREGIVING

GENERAL MANAGER

AREA MANAGER

DISTRICT COMMUNITY MANAGER

ACM - CARE & PROTECTION

DISTRICT OFFICERS

KEY
Flow →
Reverse Flow ←
Fragmented - - - - -
Self-Contained ○
Barren ———
"Burnout is fundamentally a condition brought about by a perceived lack of control and self-efficacy at work. Thus, the most effective way to alleviate burnout is to empower the individual worker.

When administrators use their power to improve working conditions for staff, the result may be positive; but the staff have not been empowered. Only when staff take the initiative and improve conditions through their own action are they likely to experience the greater self-efficacy and control that lead to a significant reduction in burnout.

This approach to organizational change differs from others we have considered in some important ways. Rather than relying on union organizers, administrators, or OD consultants to bring about change, professionals are trained to change their own organizations, and if change is not possible to function creatively and effectively within the constraints of their organizations. Their competence and self-efficacy are the focus of the intervention, and thus such an approach should be especially effective in alleviating burnout. And the people who have the most to benefit from the intervention are the ones most directly involved."

(Cherniss, 1991)
RESEARCH ON STAFF TURNOVER

- Interactional model between individual’s coping resources and their working environments

- Examined Metropolitan North Division - 17 Community Service Centres - ranging from Wyong, Katoomba to Bondi - 196 D.O.’s, N = 122 (62%)

- **Findings**
  
  Δ - Demographic
  
  nearly 20% employed for less than a year
  70% employed for less than 5 years
  90% employed for less than 10 years

- 3 Stepwise multiple regressions
  
  **Emotional Exhaustion -**
  
  Δ Low Cognitive Resources
  Δ Low Involvement
  Δ High Work Pressure
  Δ Low Supervisor Support

  **Depersonalisation -**
  
  Δ Low Cognitive Resources
  Δ High Task Orientation
  Δ Low Innovation

  **Personal Accomplishment -**
  
  Δ High Cognitive Resources
  Δ High Social Resources
AN INTERACTIVE MODEL OF BURNOUT

COPING RESOURCES (PERSON)

- Cognitive
- Social
- Emotional
- Spiritual/Philosophical
- Physical

COPING

↑ Personal Accomp't
↓ Emotional Exh't'n
↓ Depersonalisat'n

WORK ENVIRONMENT (ENVIRONMENT)

- Involvement
- Peer Cohesion
- Supervisor Support
- Autonomy
- Task Orientation
- Work Pressure
- Clarity
- Control
- Innovation
- Physical Comfort

BURNING OUT

↓ Personal Accomplish't
↑ Emotional Exhaustion
↑ Depersonalisation
A PREDICTIVE MODEL OF BURNOUT

COPING RESOURCES
(PERSON)

- Low Cognitive
- Low Social

WORK ENVIRONMENT
 ENVIRONMENT)

- Low Involvement
- Low Supervisor Support
- High Task Orientation
- High Work Pressure
- Low Innovation

BURNING OUT

- Low Personal Accomplishment
- High Emotional Exhaustion
- High Depersonalisation
QUIZ - DAY 1

1. Define the three elements of burnout:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

2. The most significant contributor to burnout of these three elements is: 

3. Five correlates, or signs/symptoms of burnout are:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

4. Three background factors that would make a worker more prone to burnout would be:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

5. Name three behavioural indicators that demonstrate caregiving:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

6. Name two patterns of organisational caregiving:
   1. 
   2. 

7. What was the single most important predictor of burnout in the research on staff turnover?
How well were the course objectives met for you? I feel that...

I am confident that I can:

Define the essential elements of burnout
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

Recognise characteristics of people that are more prone to burnout
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

Recognise patterns that may make myself prone to burnout
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

Define patterns of organisational caregiving
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

The pace of the course was:
Just right Δ Too fast Δ Too slow Δ

Comments:

The course was pitched:
Just right Δ Too fast Δ Too slow Δ

Comments:

The presenter was:
Excellent Δ Good Δ Fair Δ Poor Δ

Comments:

One suggestion I would make is:
DAY 2
- OVERHEADS
## BURNOUT PREVENTION WORKSHOP - DAY 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am -</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Coping Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Cognitive Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am -</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Social Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am -</td>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am -</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm -</td>
<td>Positive Changes and the Personal Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm -</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm -</td>
<td>Summarising and The Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING RESOURCES

- characteristic or ongoing behaviours that enable individuals to handle stressors more effectively, experience fewer or less intense symptoms upon exposure to a stressor, or recover faster from exposure to a stressor

- facets of personality that may increase an individual’s potential for dealing effectively with stress

- individuals with low resources have been described as vulnerable and constitutionally fragile

- individuals with high resources have been characterised as resilient and hardy

- women seek more emotional support as a coping resource than males

- the coping strategies that an individual chooses to utilise in a particular situation will be influenced by their coping resources and their appraisal of the event

- subjective appraisal of the event is considered to be more important than the objective characteristics on which the event can be described - individual’s experience of the event
Coping Resources (cont’d…)

• coping resources may intervene at three stages in the stress-health relationship;
  Δ prior to a stressful event
  Δ between a stressful event and the personal strain that it stimulates
  Δ between strain and the physical or psychological responses

• two ways of coping
  Δ escape coping; avoiding or ignoring difficult situations
  Δ control coping; utilising strategies to confront or address difficulties

• people who use control oriented strategies are less likely to be experiencing burnout

• control copers report better relationships with their supervisors and co-workers, and more opportunities to develop their professional competence
COGNITIVE RESOURCES

• the extent to which individuals maintain a positive sense of self worth, and a positive outlook towards others, and optimism about life in general

• most significant predictor of all three aspects of burnout

• negative evaluation of stressful situations can lead to psychological strain

• satisfaction with work, supervision, co-workers, pay and opportunities for promotion was negatively associated with burnout among human service professionals
LEARNED HELPLESSNESS

- characterised by feelings in the individual of personal responsibility for failures, conceiving of failure as a pervasive quality of personal experience. Conception of success as fortuitous and does not take responsibility when it occurs

- individuals with a “pessimistic” explanatory style are more likely to display helplessness when confronted with a bad event than those with an “optimistic” explanatory style

- situations perceived as offering opportunity for change are more likely to be linked to problem-oriented approaches Δ people more likely to use strategies that keep them focused on the problem; confrontation, planful problem-solving, acceptance of responsibility, and selective attendance to the positive aspects of the encounter

- situations that are perceived as offering little opportunity for change are linked to coping strategies that are emotion-focused Δ people more likely to use distancing and escape-avoidance - strategies that allow the person not to focus on situation

- uncontrollable failure will be followed by lowered response initiation and less persistence after failure

- linked to low self-esteem
LEARNED HELPLESSNESS: A SCIENTIFIC STUDY

Two matched dogs were placed one at a time in a room with a shock grid floor. One could do something to turn off the shock, the other could do nothing.

When first shocked both dogs jumped, yelped and tried to figure out how to turn off the shock. The dog in the "controllable" situation had little difficulty learning to turn off the shock with a lever. Every time the dog was put in the room, it quickly turned off the shock. This dog was highly motivated.

In the "uncontrollable" situation there was nothing the second dog could do to turn off the shock. Just like the first dog, it tried to figure out how to turn off the shock until the dog learned it was helpless. Then the dog gave up and lay down on the floor and took the shock. This dog was no longer motivated to even try to escape.

Later, the dog that had learned it was helpless was put into the room with the lever for turning off the shock. But the dog just lay on the floor and took the shock. Even when the door was left wide open, the dog did not attempt to escape. It just lay there. The dog had learned that it was helpless and continued to act accordingly, even though the situation had changed.

When the dog "learned" it was helpless

- It stopped trying. Its motivation to escape was extinguished.
- The dog exhibited a lot of negative emotions. It yelped and growled, then it whimpered and eventually just lay there.
- Something happened that interfered with the dog's ability to learn that things had changed and it could do something.

Powerlessness at work can affect you in the same way

Δ Impaired motivation
Δ Negative emotions
Δ Inability to learn or adapt to changes

Feelings of powerlessness cause burnout.

(Potter, 1987)
"It is not stress but our reaction to stress that creates problems physically and psychologically. A negative reaction results in distress - a physical and psychological state tied to high blood pressure, ulcers, backaches, and headaches. A positive reaction results in eustress - a motivating force that heightens energy levels and increases productivity.

Changing distress to eustress begins with a change in attitude. Problems upset the status quo, disrupting the balance we have created among the various stressors in our lives. But solving the problems will rarely return us to the status quo; Solutions will change the basic situation, often for the better. Focusing on the positive effects of solutions - that is, upon the possibilities inherent in the problem - helps change anger, shock or frustration into the energy and enthusiasm needed to solve the problem.

Recently a small, private school was forced to close because of financial difficulties. The teachers, who had always been overworked and underpaid, reacted in two different ways. One group saw the closing as the culmination of a long history of injustices and crises and sued the religious order that owned the school for irreparable damage to their careers and livelihood. The other group saw the closing as a welcome release from an unrewarding situation and an opportunity to find better jobs. All of the teachers in the second group experienced eustress, which re-energized their careers. The teachers in the first group experienced distress and began a cycle of reaction and anxiety, which in most cases has resulted in burning out, and leaving the teaching profession.

(Martinez, 1989)
ORIENTATION TOWARDS LIFE

A study of high burnout and low burnout teachers: "Teachers in the high-stress/high-burnout group tended to choose passive strategies to cope with stress, such as cutting out activities or becoming angry. Their physical condition was poor, with high incidence of both mental and physical illness. They tended to have an external locus of control - that is, to see themselves as "victims of the changes in their environment". And they experienced higher levels of alienation. Teachers in the high-stress/low-burnout group used active coping strategies, such as getting involved in a hobby or adopting a humorous attitude. They were generally healthier. They had a more internal locus of control, taking a proactive rather than reactive approach to events in their lives. And they "felt more involved in the various aspects of their life, including work, self, family, interpersonal relationships, and social institutions..."

(Martinez, 1989)
THE OPTIMIST CREED

I PROMISE MYSELF

To be so strong that nothing can disturb my peace of mind

To talk health, happiness and prosperity to every person I meet

To make all my friends feel that there is something in them

To look at the sunny side of everything and make my optimism come true

To think only of the best, to work only for the best, and expect only the best

To be just as enthusiastic about the success of others as I am about my own

To forget the mistakes of the past and press on to the greater achievements of the future

To wear a cheerful countenance at all times and give every person I meet a smile

To give so much time to the improvement of myself that I have no time to criticise others

To be too large for worry, too noble for anger, too strong for fear and too happy to permit the presence of trouble
The Muddy Road: A Zen Story

Two monks were walking along a muddy road when they came upon a beautiful woman unable to cross the road without getting her silk shoes muddy. Without saying a word, the first monk picked up and carried the woman across the road, leaving her on the other side. Then the two monks continued walking without talking until the end of the day. When they reached their destination, the second monk said, "You know monks are to avoid women. Why did you pick up that woman this morning?" The first monk replied, "I left her on the side of the road. Are you still carrying her?"

(Potter, 1987)
SOCIAL RESOURCES

- *the degree to which individuals are embedded in social networks that are able to provide support in times of stress*

- social resources include family, friends, spouse, children and peer groups at work (low peer support increases burnout) - the quality of social support can predict psychosomatic complaints and feelings of depression

- the presence of a supportive social network offers encouragement and assistance in the development of strategies directed towards the management of the problem

- individuals with a supportive family environment rely more on active coping strategies than individuals without this support

- individuals without access to social support rely on other types of emotion-focused coping (eg escape and avoidance strategies)

- social support can help increase an individual’s sense of control over the environment - through participation in decision-making

- human service workers are interactors and communicators, involvement and support from supervisor and colleagues helps preserve effective interaction with clients
PEER SUPPORT

- peer group supervision - professionals that meet together regularly to review cases and treatment approaches without a leader, share expertise, and take responsibility for their own and each other's development, and for maintaining standards of clinical services

- all members of peer group share equal responsibility for the functioning, outcomes, and decisions of the group

- offers the opportunity to increase trust, decrease anxiety and facilitate increased independent and interdependent functioning

- Peer support can help caregivers temporarily become care seekers. Helps to halt the process of depersonalisation.

- support groups can meet each week or month - can allow worker to tell their worst experience, to reframe this positively and to work out what they would do now

- efficient way to utilise the resources of more experienced workers

- obstacles where workers have fear of exposing their limitations to others - reluctance to reveal mistakes and potential for disapproval
SPOUSE AND FAMILY SUPPORT

- close friends and family reaffirm competence and self-worth

- they can help get things done and provide valuable information

- they can help handle difficult situations

- they can listen to problems and give feedback

- they can help you learn new skills

- they can encourage the tackling of challenges and the accomplishment of goals

- increased feelings of burnout associated with depression, anxiety and irritableness. Workers often report lower marital satisfaction. Spouse often aware of job dissatisfaction, but not level of stress/strain. Need to educate spouses to facilitate support and communication
SOCIAL RESOURCES

Using the circles below, identify your support networks. With you in the middle, place the people who you are most friendly and intimate with on the first ring, those who are very good friends on the next ring, and so on...

When you have finished, note how extensive your social support network is, and evaluate it to see if you need to extend it and build your social resources.
Social support acts as a buffer against stress and burnout. You can tolerate a greater degree of stress when you have caring and supportive relationships. In fact, research shows that people with close emotional and social ties are physically and mentally healthier and live longer!

Close friends and good relationships with co-workers and family reaffirm your competence and self-worth. They can help you to get things done and provide you with valuable information. They can help you handle difficult situations. They can listen to your problems and give feedback. They can help you learn new skills. They can encourage you to tackle challenges and accomplish goals.

Hints for Building Social Relationships

Invite others: Don’t just wait to be invited. Start inviting others to do things with you. Ask co-workers to join you for lunch, look through the paper for interesting events and ask a friend to accompany you. People love to be invited out.

Show interest in others: The most powerful resource you have for building social relationships is your attention. When you pay attention to others, they feel good about themselves and about you. Showing interest is easy. All you have to do is ask questions. Find out how others feel about community issues. Ask about hobbies. Be curious about what others want to accomplish.

Make others winners: It’s easy to make others winners. All you have to do is notice what a person is doing well and comment on it. It only takes a minute. Try it.

Be helpful: When you help others accomplish their goals, they are inclined to want to help you too. Helping doesn’t take a lot of effort. Sometimes it is as easy as sharing information. Or you might introduce people to each other. Get outside of yourself and think about what you could do to help someone else. Even if nothing comes of it, helping feels good.

Ask for advice: When you ask others for advice they feel flattered. They feel important. And they become committed to you. They want to see you succeed.

(Potter, 1987)
Make a Plan for Building Social Support

Relationships don’t develop in a vacuum. You must create them. Think of specific things you can do today to start building your relationships.

What I can do to build my relationships with family and friends:

1. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

2. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

3. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

4. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

5. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

What I can do to build my relationships with co-workers:

1. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

2. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

3. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

4. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

5. With ____________________________
   I can ____________________________

What I can do to become involved in professional or social associations:

1. I can ____________________________

2. I can ____________________________

3. I can ____________________________

(Potter, 1987)
SUPERVISOR SUPPORT

• the extent to which management is supportive of employees and encourages employees to be supportive of one another

• supervisory support may not be effective in reducing burnout as there may be a mismatch of expectations regarding work performance between supervisors and workers eg; if support is only for quantitative aspects of the job, or if support is diluted by criticism

• the supervisor can be a major source of stress or a significant figure in the prevention and management of burnout - workers with supportive supervisors reported lower levels of experienced burnout, and increased morale

• a good supervisor will establish rapport, get to know workers and their interests, expertise and philosophy, and their stage of professional development. Also need to show kindness, and focus on the worker’s professional and personal development. Should also model appropriate behaviour, be able to discuss problems, recognise achievement and encourage experimentation, and learning from one another
Supervisor Support (cont'd...)

- informal acts also important - disseminating professional material, focusing professional interests around specific themes, encouraging experimentation and motivation, and publicising achievements

- need to be easily approachable, show concerns for the employees feelings and opinions and encourage the employees self-expression

- supervisor needs to be trained to detect the symptoms of burnout and provide greater support to employees

- supervisors need to spend time in planning organising and advocating for staff
**Supervision**

- individual supervision - the aim is to confirm the individual, to encourage developing skills, and to teach new ones - allows for a closer analysis of the individual’s difficulties and strengths, and provides a comprehensive approach to tackling them, and giving reinforcement and encouragement. Ensures quality work is produced

- supervision needing to incorporate support, feedback, empathy, and understanding. Also needs to incorporate facilitating contact for professional development resources, and to facilitate study breaks or leaves

- good supervision allows the worker to make a more realistic appraisal of the problems and solutions that all of the workers in that situation encounter - leads to lack of isolation about the work requirements

- different developmental needs of supervision - ranging from on-site training and instruction to ongoing professional development needs

- poor supervision linked to disillusionment

- major barriers to supervision - artificiality, formality, being judgmental, and being threatening - also infrequency of supervision, incompetence of the supervisor, and distance between the supervisor and worker
Getting Feedback

People often feel stressed in their jobs if they do not receive adequate feedback on their performance. Insufficient feedback makes people feel alienated, worthless, unproductive and can lead to poor self-esteem. This sheet is designed to help you identify sources of feedback. You can then plan specific actions to ensure feedback is received.

1. List below your major job activities and/or job outcomes
   a. ____________________________
   b. ____________________________
   c. ____________________________
   d. ____________________________
   e. ____________________________
   f. ____________________________

2. For each of the above, now identify sources of feedback that you can use or tap into. Ask yourself the question: “How can I find out if I am doing this aspect of my job well or not?”

Sources of feedback can include
   • informal, random discussions with key people (supervisor, peers)
   • regular, formal discussions with key people
   • interviews
   • questionnaires given to clients
   • organisational data (statistics)
   • output, results

   a. ____________________________
   b. ____________________________
   c. ____________________________
   d. ____________________________
   e. ____________________________
   f. ____________________________

3. Now go through the list at Step 2 and identify any sources of feedback that you do not currently use. Write down what you will do in the near future to start tapping into these sources. For example; if you identified regular formal discussions with a particular key person as a currently unused source of feedback, your plan might read;
   “Approach Joan Smith and arrange the first of a series of regular discussions in which she will give me a detailed feedback on my job performance.”

Plan 1

________________________________________

Plan 2

________________________________________

(Ash & Quarry, 1988)
"It seems that as an organization, as a movement, we have let our people come to the breaking point before providing them with any help with burnout. This help, when it arrives, is often in the form of vacations. Vacations usually relieve burnout - but we must start providing our people with protection from burnout, rather than just relieving it once it's present.

I think one of the most important ways of preventing burnout is to set clearly defined, realistic goals for the organization and for ourselves as individuals. This means having measurable and achievable expectations of what we can do. We all have limits, and I think we can avoid a lot of frustration if we recognize them at the beginning."

Rose Kapolozyvnski
Colorado Open Space Council
(Bryan, 1980)
10 THINGS THAT I WANT TO CHANGE:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

Now circle the numbers of things that are possible to change. It is important to remember that some things we would like to change, but are not possible. For these things we need to look at alternate ways of viewing the situation, or alternate responses to the situation in order to decrease the personal stress involved.
MAKING POSITIVE CHANGES

Managing yourself is not a matter of will power, rather it is an array of simple but effective techniques such as:

- Using fun to reward dull work
- Patting yourself on the back
- Indulging yourself contingently
- Breaking big jobs down into manageable steps

The tools to help you improve self-management include:

- Setting goals
- Setting objectives

HOW TO SET GOALS

Personal Goal Setting

Goals are tools for helping you make the right decisions. Each day you encounter choices or forks in the road. When you have a goal, it is easier to make choices and to know which path to take. In other words, a goal acts as a beacon to point the way. Without goals, you can go around and around, never getting where you want to go. Once you achieve a goal, it is important to set another one. Following are some principles to keep in mind as you establish your personal goals:

1. Be Positive

State what you want to do. If you want to avoid or stop doing something, state your goal in terms of what you want to do instead.

2. Set a Deadline

Suppose you were learning archery but didn’t have a target, so you just practised by
shooting in the air. How successful would you be in becoming skilled in archery? Chances are your progress would be slow. You need a target to shoot for. A deadline provides such a target. It gives you something to aim at.

3. Be specific

Suppose you have a target, but you can’t see where your arrow hits. Again, your shooting skill would develop very slowly. You need to see where the last shot went so that you can adjust your next shot. This feedback helps you measure your progress towards the goal. Measurability helps determine whether or not you have achieved your goal. The more specific your goal, the easier it is to measure your progress. Your goal statement should answer the following questions:

Δ Who?
Δ Will do what?
Δ When?
Δ Where?
Δ To what extent?
   Under what conditions? To what degree?
   How much? How long? How hard?: etc.

Notice the emphasis on doing. What will the accomplished goal look like? What will you be doing? (Feeling? Saying? Having? Thinking?)

EXAMPLES OF POORLY WRITTEN AND WELL WRITTEN GOALS

Setting Better Goals

Remember that to be effective, goals should be positive, carry a deadline and be specific. Following are some examples of poorly written and improved goals.

Δ Poor: I will stop fighting with people in my department

This goal statement violates all of the guidelines. It's negative, stating only what you want to stop doing. There is no deadline. And there is nothing to count:
measuring “not fighting” is difficult.

Δ Poor: I will improve my relationships at work.

This goal is stated positively. However, it violates the other two guidelines. What does an improved relationship look like? How will you recognize it? What will you be doing and which co-workers will be doing what when the relationship is “improved” are not specified. Finally, there is no deadline.

Δ Better: By the beginning of the year, I will socialize after hours with Ralph at least once a month.

There is a deadline and the goal statement is very specific. It will be easier to achieve this goal than the first two because you know what to do and when you have done it. An “improved relationship” has been defined in terms of what you will be doing: “socializing after hours”. It states which co-worker is the target, and specifying the frequency and conditions of the socializing makes measurement possible.

Let’s try another one;

Δ Poor: I will improve my time management by September 1st.

The goal statement is positive and there is a deadline. But it is still poorly stated because we don’t know the doing of time management. What you want to do is vague, which makes it hard to know where to start and difficult to determine if and when the goal has been achieved.

“Time management” can be made more specific if you ask yourself: “What will I be doing when I’ve improved my time management?” Here are some examples:

Δ Better: By January 1, I will be able to satisfactorily complete all of my assignments and still have at least one hour per day available for discretionary work projects.

Δ Better: By Christmas I will be devoting at least two weekends a month to recreational activities.

(Potter, 1987)
SETTING OBJECTIVES

Objectives are tools for making the steps needed to achieve your goal. An objective is a precise statement of what you plan to do during each step. Objectives can be thought of as mini-goals.

1. Break your goal into a series of smaller steps necessary to accomplish it.
2. Arrange the steps in a logical sequence.
3. Follow the Goal-Setting Guidelines. When stating your first objective: Be specific. Be positive. Set a deadline.

1. **Set Yourself Up to Win**

Your small step should be only as big as what you *know* you can achieve with relative ease. If it is something difficult because it’s distasteful or involves an entrenched habit, then shorten the time frame of the objective. For example, suppose you want to stop smoking. If, for your first objective, you demand that you will chew gum every time you feel like smoking for a month, you are likely to fail. Chances for success are better if you make the first objective for one day. When you meet that objective, set another one for a slightly longer period of time. Set objectives that you *know* you can meet. Set yourself up to succeed. The objective helps you get started and creates momentum. Once you’ve broken the inertia of a bad habit you have also started to develop a winner’s attitude, which will also help you to succeed.

2. **Stretch**

Although objectives should be small steps, they should be big enough to make you stretch. Think of yoga as an example. When doing yoga you position your body in a particular posture and then slowly *stretch* the muscles you are exercising. Similarly, the series of small step objectives should slowly stretch your abilities. Don’t worry about steps being too small. No step is too small as long as there is some stretch and some movement. Use small steps to keep yourself in motion toward your goal.
3. **Make Getting There Fun**

People often equate self-management or self-discipline with austerity - the withholding of pleasures, or punishment. Such an approach is a mistake and will undermine your success. Grease the skids of change with fun. Enjoyment of a task lessens the toil of doing it. Consider physical exercising. Doing jumping jacks and running on the spot isn’t much fun. By comparison, playing tennis with a friend is fun. And it provides a good workout. With this in mind, think of ways you can build fun into the process of achieving your goals.

(Potter, 1987)
MY FORTNIGHT’S GOAL


SMALL STEPS: First list, then sequence with 1 being the first step, 2 being the second and so on.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

OBJECTIVE FOR FIRST STEP: Be Specific

What I will do:

Where - In what situation:

How much - To what degree:

By When:

Rewards for Accomplishment

Giving yourself acknowledgment for what you’ve done well provides the motivation to continue to climb the small steps. Poor self-managers tend to do just the opposite. They focus on their failures and criticise what they did wrong. Self-criticism tends to set up a vicious cycle of “working to avoid”, in which work is done to avoid guilt and anxious feelings. Self-acknowledgment, on the other hand, promotes “working for.” It stimulates much better feelings.

Acknowledgment can be expressed in a variety of ways, such as by giving yourself things you want, by allowing yourself to do things you enjoy, or by giving yourself praise for things you have done well. (Potter, 1987)
Being Realistic

Now that you have done some planning, evaluate how realistic it has been. Will you readily be able to achieve these goals and not get even more stressed? Use the following trigger questions to evaluate your work planning.

1. How many goals have you set yourself? Is this realistic?

2. Have you set realistic priorities? Are you going to be able to stick to your priorities? Will you be tempted to juggle them?

3. Have you been realistic about timeliness? Have you left enough time to complete things? Have you taken into account unavoidable interruptions, crises, and that others might not cooperate?

4. Reviewing the answers to the above questions, can you see any pattern or theme? Is there any area of your work planning where you consistently fail or are unrealistic?

5. What do you need to change to improve your self-management and reduce your stress? NOW DO IT!!

(Ash & Quarry, 1988)
## STRESSORS

|------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|-------|------|--------|---------|----------|---------|----------------|-------|

**Daily Temperature:**
- 5°C - mild stress
- 10°C - moderate stress
- 15°C - extreme stress
## STRESSFUL EVENTS LOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>STRESSFUL EVENT</th>
<th>WHAT HAPPENED BEFORE</th>
<th>WHAT HAPPENED AFTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUIZ - DAY 2

1. People who use __________ - oriented coping strategies are less likely to burnout.

2. Another way of describing cognitive resources is:

3. Learned helplessness occurs when the individual believes that the situation can/ can not be changed.

4. Learned helplessness at work can lead to:
   1.
   2.

5. Social support groups can include:
   1.
   2.
   3.

6. Strategies for building social relationships could include:
   1.
   2.
   3.

7. List two things that we can do to improve methods of getting feedback:
   1.
   2.

8. A Personal Plan needs to be:
   1.
   2.
   3.
EVALUATION - DAY 2

How well were the course objectives met for you?
I feel that...

I am confident that I can:

Define cognitive resources and skills that challenge negative thinking
Very well △ Well △ Not very well △ Not at all △

Explain skills for building social support networks
Very well △ Well △ Not very well △ Not at all △

Evaluate and recognise skills to promote positive Supervisor Support
Very well △ Well △ Not very well △ Not at all △

Devise a realistic Personal Plan
Very well △ Well △ Not very well △ Not at all △

The pace of the course was:
Just right △ Too fast △ Too slow △
Comments:

The course was pitched:
Just right △ Too fast △ Too slow △
Comments:

The presenter was:
Excellent △ Good △ Fair △ Poor △
Comments:

One suggestion I would make is:
DAY 3
- OVERHEADS
# BURNOUT PREVENTION WORKSHOP - DAY 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am -</td>
<td>Debriefing and Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td>Personal Stress Patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am -</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm -</td>
<td>Work Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm -</td>
<td>Summarising and The Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm -</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERSONAL STRESS GRAPH
Now that you have charted your personal stress patterns, look for generalisations that can be made about the times and situations that were distressing. Are deadlines a frequent cause for panic? Is there a particular person or type of event that appears to be very stressful for you? What responses do you use over and over? Do you eat when you feel anxious? Do you avoid certain situations?

Discover stress patterns by analysing what the situations have in common. From this analysis, you can begin making a plan for managing stress. Are there situations you can avoid? Perhaps you can foresee stressors and prepare for the encounter? How might you respond more effectively? How do other people respond in these situations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Patterns</th>
<th>My Usual Response</th>
<th>Possible Plan of Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 1987)
Develop an I-CAN-DO Attitude

Attitude is a style of thinking. People with No-Can-Do attitudes think negatively and feel powerless. They continually tell themselves that they “can’t”. People who think positively focus on what they can do. They have an I-Can-Do attitude. Consequently, they feel powerful. They feel optimistic. They rise to challenges. No-Can-Do thinking makes you feel bad. It can even damage your health. I-Can-Do thinking fuels motivation and helps prevent job burnout.

Rid yourself of negative thinking. Translate each helpless thought into a powerful one. Powerful thoughts make you feel potent and help you act to influence the situation for the better. Powerful thinking is looking at the glass as half full rather than as half empty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpless Thought</th>
<th>Powerful Thought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How could I have been so stupid?</td>
<td>I made a mistake and I can learn from my mistakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really blew it this time. I’m a fool!</td>
<td>Next time I can…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss is such a lousy supervisor. I never know what she expects.</td>
<td>It would be nice if my boss would be clear in her expectations. This is a chance to practice my assertiveness skills. I must learn how to express my concern without alienating her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I might lose control and start yelling at them. I’d better take a valium.</td>
<td>I’ll make a plan for what I can do to handle my temper. Next time I can...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She is so inconsiderate of me.</td>
<td>I’d like it if she’d call when she’s late but she doesn’t. Figuring out how to handle this is a challenge. Next time I can...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Begin by translating your habitual negative thoughts into powerful ones. When you catch yourself thinking a negative thought, yell “Stop!” inside your head to stop your negative thought. Then, immediately switch your thinking to the powerful thought. Training the mind is difficult. So remember to reward yourself generously for your successes.

(Potter, 1987)
Exercise in Powerful Thinking

Change Your Helpless Thoughts to Powerful Ones

List your habitual negative thoughts. Include all the reasons you tell yourself for not doing what you want to do; faults, failures and disappointments that you think about; others’ wrong doings that haunt you; guilt you worry about; dissatisfactions you dwell upon; unhappy memories you recall often; and any other negative thoughts you ruminate about. Then translate each helpless thought into a powerful one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helpless Thought</th>
<th>Powerful Thought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 1987)
Tricky Issues

Supervisor Support - Dealing with Inadequate Supervision

1. Reflect on what you would actually like from your supervisor (in behavioural terms), and list these needs:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

2. Now list strategies that you could use to get each of these needs met:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

3. If your supervisor is unable to meet all of these needs, list places that you could get some of these needs met within the organisation:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

4. Refer to your sheet on “Getting Feedback”, and see if you can come up with any more suggestions.
1. Isolation Within the Team
   Needs:

   Strategies:

2. Not Being Scapegoated
   Needs:

   Strategies:

3. Isolation From Management
   Needs:

   Strategies:

4. Self-Protection Skills/Strategies
   Needs:

   Strategies:

5. Reversing Reverse Flow
   Needs:

   Strategies:
IN VolVEMENT

- the extent to which employees are concerned about and committed to their jobs

- ambiguous nature of involvement, can be both a positive and a negative factor

- some workers lower their level of job involvement (ie; time and energy devoted to work) as a result of experiencing stress, but this tends to increase, rather than decrease their likelihood of future burnout

- high involvement related to high emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment

- staff who are more involved have better job performance, more satisfied with their jobs, and less likely to plan to leave the job
Enhancing Personal Involvement & Teaminess

1. Evaluate your own workplace, and work out whether there is too much or too little commitment.

2. Evaluate yourself, and your own level of personal commitment.

NOW, generate as a group:

SAFEGUARDS (when a person should recognise that they are overinvolved)...
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

STOPGAPS (strategies that a person should use to pull back from the job)...
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

PERSONAL ENHANCERS (to increase a person’s level of commitment to the job)...
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

Now develop ideas that would enhance teamwork and commitment to the team...
1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5.
WORK PRESSURE

- *the degree to which the press of work and time urgency dominate the work milieu*

- excessive work pressure and limited participation in decision-making can lead to emotional withdrawal

- work pressure correlated with job dissatisfaction and lack of recreation/relaxation
QUIZ - DAY 3

1. Factors that contribute to my stress levels are:
   1. 
   2. 

2. Involvement in the workplace can be defined as:

3. State two *safeguards* that a worker could use:
   1. 
   2. 

4. State two *stopgaps* a worker could try:
   1. 
   2. 

5. State two *personal enhancers* that would increase involvement:
   1. 
   2. 

6. Work pressure is/is not associated with burnout

7. Ways of dealing with work pressure could include:
   1. 
   2. 

8. Two other sources of feedback could include:
   1. 
   2. 

9. Two methods of decreasing isolation within the team could include:
   1. 
   2.
EVALUATION - DAY 3

How well were the course objectives met for you?
I feel that...

I am confident that I can:

**Recognise contributors to my own stress patterns**
Very well A Well A Not very well A Not at all A

**Evaluate my level of involvement in the workplace, and strategies for increasing it**
Very well A Well A Not very well A Not at all A

**Recognise when I am overloaded**
Very well A Well A Not very well A Not at all A

**Explain ways of controlling my own sense of work pressure within the workplace**
Very well A Well A Not very well A Not at all A

**The pace of the course was:**
Just right A Too fast A Too slow A
Comments:

**The course was pitched:**
Just right A Too fast A Too slow A
Comments:

**The presenter was:**
Excellent A Good A Fair A Poor A
Comments:

One suggestion I would make is:
DAY 4
- OVERHEADS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:15 am - 10:30 am</td>
<td>Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am</td>
<td>Morning Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 am - 1:00 pm</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 pm - 2:00 pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 pm - 3:30 pm</td>
<td>The Final Personal Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 pm - 4:00 pm</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 pm - 4:30 pm</td>
<td>Summarising and The Quiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 pm</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TASK ORIENTATION

- the degree of emphasis on good planning, efficiency, and getting the job done
"Due to chronic understaffing, unclear expectations about one's job, and the frequent lack of any coherent operating plan, the working conditions in a public interest organization can be extremely intense and inhumane. Often the atmosphere becomes oppressive and levity is an all-but-forgotten ingredient. The same holds true for ordinary conversing, reaching out to others in times of personal need, touching, sharing feelings, and enjoying social times together. Such human activities are usually discouraged since they aren't "work-oriented". Such thinking creates a pathological situation in which work becomes everything... Exclusive emphasis is placed on getting tasks done and little regard is given to how they are done or the impact on the individuals involved. Feelings aren't recognized, conflicts are smoothed over, or suppressed, and values of individual responsibility and equality are downplayed."

(Bryan, 1980)
Principles of Time Management

1. Review your GOALS. Decide what you want to get out of the day at work, the weekend, etc.

2. Make a LIST of the things that you think you have to do and things you would like to do, with time estimates.

3. If tasks and activities exceed the time available, decide on PRIORITIES. What must be done today, what can wait, and until when? What do I want done today? Can I delegate anything? If I can, to whom? What will happen if I don’t do X? If nothing, consider omitting X.

4. Select an ORDER or SEQUENCE for tasks to be done. Find the sort of sequence that suits you best. For example, some people find that the day is more pleasurable if they start with a task they must do and then follow it with a task they enjoy. In that way, they have something to look forward to and the unpleasant task doesn’t play on their mind all day.

5. Try to do ONE TASK AT A TIME and try to FINISH what you start. Don’t jump from one task to another leaving behind a stack of partially completed activities. In general, each task takes longer this way as you waste time getting repeatedly started on the same task and uncompleted tasks remain on your mind, interfering with the present task.

6. Don’t rush immediately from one task to another. Instead PAUSE. Plan brief BREAKS and times to relax; tea breaks, lunch breaks, times for yourself.

7. REVIEW priorities and progress midway through the day.

8. Look out for PROCRASTINATION. Are you putting it off because you’re setting yourself too high a standard? Are you being unrealistic about what you could do? Could you do it now and get it out of the way?

9. At the end of the day, REMEMBER what you have achieved and GIVE YOURSELF CREDIT.

(Hawton, Salkovskis, Kirk & Clark, 1989)
INNOVATION

- *the degree of emphasis on variety, change, and new approaches*

- the importance of environmental stimulation

- combats boredom and disillusionment

- leads to stimulation for professional growth

- importance of courses and conferences

- need for professional discussions within teams

- experimentation
Transforming Barriers into Challenges

Under "Barriers", list everything standing between where you are now and your ideal job. Under "Challenges", list what you must do to remove the barrier. Don't be "realistic". Just write down what it would take to get around the barrier. Notice what you are thinking when you do this exercise. If you hear yourself saying a lot of reasons why you "can't", then list "negative thinking" as one of the barriers. Overcoming negative thinking is one of the greatest challenges of all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Potter, 1987)
Expand Your Job

You were hired to provide a solution:
You were not hired to do a job, but to solve a problem. For example, a person is not hired to file papers, but to solve a paper organisation problem. What is the major problem you were hired to solve?

Answer:

Jobs are elastic. They can be stretched. Jobs are alive. They can grow and evolve. You can make your job stretch and grow to fit you better.

The best way to expand your job is to identify unattached problems. These are problems that have not been assigned to any specific person. Take possession of unattached problems you feel you can solve and that interest you. In most cases, this strategy doesn’t require asking permission. Clever career strategists obtain formal authorisation after the fact. Depending upon how important the solution is to the company, you might be able to use formally bestowed responsibility to obtain an upgraded job title, add support staff or services, or possibly even get a raise.

(Potter, 1987)

List below any projects that you can think of that would add to your work dimension (please be as whacky, and as serious as possible!)

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
CONCLUSION

"If all the knowledge and advice about how to treat burnout could be summed up in one word, that word would be *balance*. Balance between giving and getting, balance between stress and calm, balance between work and home. These stand in clear contrast to the overload, understaffing, overcommitment and other imbalances of burnout...

The basic message here is that giving of yourself must be balanced with giving to yourself. Making yourself strong, knowledgeable, and in good spirits makes you a better provider for those in need. Thus, it is sensible (not selfish) to take time off to relax, to seek out advice and support from others, to mix periods of undemanding work among the more stressful ones, to stop job spill-over into your home life, and so forth. If you recognize your limits and acknowledge your needs, you will be less likely to overextend yourself to the point of no recovery. This does not mean that you cannot go overboard at times, when you think it is necessary; however, if you do so, then you need to do something extra to recuperate and restore yourself."

(Maslach, 1982)
THE FINAL PERSONAL PLAN

- making an individual action plan that will work

- setting limits

- setting a time frame

- use of networks

- plan the work, work the plan!
THE FINAL PERSONAL PLAN

Five goals that I have are:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

To achieve my first goal of: 
I will: 1. 
2. 
3. 
By: 

To achieve my second goal of: 
I will: 1. 
2. 
3. 
By: 

To achieve my third goal of: 
I will: 1. 
2. 
3. 
By: 

To achieve my fourth goal of: 
I will: 1. 
2. 
3. 
By: 

To achieve my fifth goal of: 
I will: 1. 
2. 
3. 
By: 
One Month Objectives Worksheet

MY ONE MONTH GOAL

________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________
________________________________________

SMALL STEPS: First list, then sequence with 1 being the first step, 2 being the second and so on.

1. _______________________________________
2. _______________________________________
3. _______________________________________
4. _______________________________________
5. _______________________________________

OBJECTIVE FOR FIRST STEP: Be Specific

What I will do:
Where - In what situation:
How much - To what degree:
By When:

Rewards for Accomplishment

Giving yourself acknowledgment for what you've done well provides the motivation to continue to climb the small steps. Poor self-managers tend to do just the opposite. They focus on their failures and criticise what they did wrong. Self-criticism tends to set up a vicious cycle of "working to avoid", in which work is done to avoid guilt and anxious feelings. Self-acknowledgment, on the other hand, promotes "working for." It stimulates much better feelings.

Acknowledgment can be expressed in a variety of ways, such as by giving yourself things you want, by allowing yourself to do things you enjoy, or by giving yourself praise for things you have done well. (Potter, 1987)
One Year Objectives Worksheet

MY ONE YEAR GOAL


SMALL STEPS: First list, then sequence with 1 being the first step, 2 being the second and so on.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

OBJECTIVE FOR FIRST STEP: Be Specific

What I will do:

Where - In what situation:

How much - To what degree:

By When:

Rewards for Accomplishment

Giving yourself acknowledgment for what you've done well provides the motivation to continue to climb the small steps. Poor self-managers tend to do just the opposite. They focus on their failures and criticise what they did wrong. Self-criticism tends to set up a vicious cycle of "working to avoid", in which work is done to avoid guilt and anxious feelings. Self-acknowledgment, on the other hand, promotes "working for." It stimulates much better feelings.

Acknowledgment can be expressed in a variety of ways, such as by giving yourself things you want, by allowing yourself to do things you enjoy, or by giving yourself praise for things you have done well.  

(Potter, 1987)
"QUICK FIX" CHECKLIST

1. Do a needs assessment on yourself - try to work out what your needs are and how well those needs are being met in your life now.

2. Have fun - don't take yourself too seriously. Use your workspace to express yourself (pictures on the wall etc.)

3. Take your own advice - do what you are advising your clients to do. Try to eat well, exercise regularly, look at your own dependencies. Consider using the services of other professionals.

4. Jettison your secrets - ensure that you have an effective support group of friends and/or colleagues with whom you can discuss your problems and difficulties.

5. Counterbalance your work - look at how much time you spend at work and thinking about work, and how much time you give other areas of your life. Try sports, art, crafts etc. to take your mind off work.

(Burrows, 1989)
QUIZ - DAY 4

1. Task Orientation is different to Work Pressure in that:

2. Methods of combating the emphasis on Task Orientation in the workplace could include:
   1. 
   2. 

3. Innovation can be defined as:

4. Innovation in the workplace is important because:
   1. 
   2. 

5. Two innovative projects would be:
   1. 
   2. 

6. A personal plan should:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

7. The three elements of burnout are:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

8. Cognitive resources can be defined as:
**EVALUATION - DAY 4**

How well were the course objectives met for you?
I feel that...

I am confident that I can:

*Recognise the level of emphasis on task orientation in the workplace*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Define the concept of innovation in the workplace*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Explain methods for developing innovative projects in the workplace*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Devise a realistic Personal Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The pace of the course was:

Just right | Δ | Too fast | Δ | Too slow | Δ |
|------------|---|---------|---|---------|---|

Comments:

The course was pitched:

Just right | Δ | Too fast | Δ | Too slow | Δ |
|------------|---|---------|---|---------|---|

Comments:

The presenter was:

Excellent | Δ | Good | Δ | Fair | Δ | Poor | Δ |
|-----------|---|------|---|------|---|-----|---|

Comments:

One suggestion I would make is:
COURSE EVALUATION

How well were the course objectives met for you?
I feel that...

I am confident that I can:

Define the three features of burnout
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

Recognise the factors that may make me prone to burnout
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

Develop strategies to intervene in these factors
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

Recognise the signs and symptoms of burnout in others
Very well Δ Well Δ Not very well Δ Not at all Δ

Would you recommend the course to others?

Out of the topics covered, which did you find the most useful? (You can list more than one)

What would you recommend leaving out of the course?

Should the course be made shorter? (for example, three days?)

Would you recommend the course to be included in departmental training?

Any other comments or suggestions?
Dear

Many thousands of thanks for agreeing to participate in the research on staff burnout. This is the first of the two questionnaires. Please could you fill it in and return it to me as soon as you are able. I have tried to make it as user friendly as possible (even down to the self-seal envelope!), but call me at Manly CSC on 977 6011, or at home on 904 1545, if you have any queries.

The final questionnaire will be being sent to you in 8 weeks time. Both questionnaires are vital to the survey, as the data is irrelevant if only one of them is filled in - and as we don't have too many of you, you are all crucial!!

Thank you for your participation,

Lucy Blunt
4th July, 1995

Dear

OOPS!!! WHAT A LOSER!! One very diligent and observant person has noticed that I repeated myself in one of the scales in the survey on staff burnout. SO, to correct my error, please note that on THE ATTRIBUTIONAL STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE, questions 34, 35, & 36 should be replaced with (please write the answers on the actual questionnaire - not on this):

Your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend) has been treating you more lovingly.

34) Is the cause of your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend) treating you more lovingly due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

35) In future interactions with your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend), will this cause again be present?

36) Is the cause something that just affects how your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend) treats you, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

The workshop participants have remarked upon how difficult some of these situational questions are to answer, however if you can just go for an in general kind of response, then that's fine.

If possible, could you return this batch of questionnaires by around July 20th, or as soon after you get a chance.

Please call me at work on 977 6011, or at home on 904 1545 if you have any queries.

Many thanks once again,

Lucy Blunt
August 25, 1995

Dear

Well, now we come to the final round of questionnaires, and the answer is... yes, it is the same questionnaire as the first one - so I haven't made a mistake!!

Please could you complete these as soon as possible... I have enclosed an incentive to encourage early completion - preferably by September 8th, or as soon after as you can. It is really important that you fill this one in as well as having filled in the first, as I can only use data where I have received both questionnaires, and as you are such a small group, you all count!!

The research is going well, I'm hoping to have at least finished a draft by the end of the year, at which stage I can give you all some feedback.

Thank you once again for having been such super people, I've really appreciated your participation. Please call me at work on 9977 6011, or at home on 9904 1545 if you have any queries.

Many thanks once again,

Lucy Blunt
September 18, 1995

Dear

Many thanks to those truly wondrous people who have already filled in the 2nd round of questionnaires (11 out of the 14 who came to the workshop, and 15 out of the 19 who have been doing the questionnaires).

However..., I realise that there is an extra special bunch of you, who were so thrilled at having eaten the Smarties (because I'm sure that you did eat them), that you put the questionnaire somewhere extra special, so that you wouldn't forget to fill it in. (But just where was that somewhere extra special???) Alternatively, you are now glancing guiltily at that big fat yellow envelope and thinking, "Wow, are there really Smarties in there?"

In either case... if you could possibly manage to find the time to fill in the yellow treasure, and return it pronto, I would be much obliged. As you are so special, and few in number, it would be wonderful if I could get as many back as possible. If you have perhaps lost (or just temporarily misplaced) the little darling, call me at work on 9977 6011, or at home on 9904 1545 if you would like another.

Many thanks once again (particularly to the diligent people who ate their Smarties and have filled it in already!)

Lucy Blunt
APPENDIX O

STUDY 3 - TAPE TRANSCRIPT

LB: Well... What I thought that I'd do is actually get some feedback from you guys first because the results will take approximately five and a half minutes to deliver, so it's actually up to you as to how you would prefer to do it. Do you want to go through the results first and then talk about them, or would you like to...?

DO5: Yeah.

LB: Ok. Let's do that then. So... I'll find the trusty sheet that I've actually put them on. Here we go. Oh, as you can see, it's a well organised presentation today.

DO1: Did everyone send their results back?

LB: From here, I got 13 out of the 14 back, which was terrific. I was really happy with that, and no I don't know who the 14th was, so you can't pick on them!! OK, in terms of summary stats, as you know what I was doing at the time was running a Control group, you guys were what I called the Treatment group, which was the people who came to the intervention, which was the workshop, and so you were the guinea pigs so to speak. At the same time, you remember on that flyer that I sent round, I asked for people who didn't want to come to the workshop, but who wanted to participate in the research anyway, so they were what I called the Control group. And they're the people who did both questionnaires as well, but didn't do anything other than that, they just stayed at work. Yeah? OK. So, this is just what the groups looked like, is that reasonably clear? This is what the groups looked like in terms of breakdown, you had um... and these are just frequencies, just actual numbers. There were
19 in the Control group, of whom 16 sent back all... both questionnaires, and
14 within our group, of whom 13 sent back both questionnaires. All right? So
there were 4 guys, 15 females in the Control group, and about the same,
roughly the same proportion, slightly less in terms of the Treatment group.
Your age groups was predominantly younger for all of them, you’ve got a
couple in those last age groups, but mainly everyone was under 50, with your
main around the 25-35, which was about what we would expect for our things.
Marital Status, most people were single, some married, some divorced, I
couldn’t quite work out what the “Other” was...

DO2: Yes! I was just asking DO8, you were aiming for polygamy or
something, were you?

LB: I don’t know, I guess it could be separated. People who aren’t quite
divorced yet. Number of children, of course because we’ve got such a high
single, you’re going to have more with no kids, although, not necessarily true,
OK, all right, I’m sorry. The employment in current position again is really
interesting for me, with most people being employed for less than five years. It
is probably more even in this group than it was for the control group. So,
that’s just in terms of who did it, what they looked like. OK. So what I was
looking at, if you remember, was if there was any difference between people
who did the workshop, and people who didn’t do the workshop, over time. So
there was 8 weeks from the beginning of the workshop, and six weeks for you
guys from when you finished it, and in terms of the sort of cognitive
behavioural type theory, the idea would be if something is going to change, it
will start to change within that six week period. Although other things may be
long term. As you can see, what I’ve put here is Time 1, which was at the
beginning of the workshop, and Time 2 is the 6 weeks following the
completion of the workshop. OK? Emotional Exhaustion. Who remembers what Emotional Exhaustion is?

DO1: How you feel just before your holidays?

LB: Yes, very nice anecdotal experience. OK, you can get one for that. Yep, any sort of symptomatology we can give with that? What sort of...

DO1: Depersonalisation...

LB: That's the next one. You can have it just for remembering though.

DO3: Oh, be quiet DO1!

DO1: I'll share them with you later.

LB: It's quite a big bucket! Emotional Exhaustion. That's when you're feeling really strung out, like at the end of your tether, getting home at the end of your day, feeling as though you've absolutely had it, can't give to anyone else, don't want to know about anyone else, just feeling strung out. Your depersonalisation, anyone got any ideas on that one?

DO4: I remember the kidney in room 402 - is that the one?

LB: Yes, well done! It's the kidney in room 303. Rather than, Mr 60 year old Jones, you know, dadadada.

DO4: I actually thought, I remember that, I saw that, was it on RPA the other night? They did that. I thought "I remember that from..."
DO5: Lucy, what's the measurement, like, what's the actual figure? Like how did you get to that? What does it mean? Do you know what I mean?

LB: Yeah, I know what you mean. What we're actually going to do is. Because last time I couldn't give you the actual measure, what I've actually brought along is the one that was significant, and you can fill in your own, and actually see where you score, and these are the ranges and where it scores and what it all means at the moment. So yes, you're right, at the moment, this is meaningless. But, what I'm trying to show you is the effect of change.

DO3: But, what's the score out of?

LB: Yeah, that's what I'm talking about.

DO5: Are the scores for Emotional Exhaustion higher, like it was worse at Time 2?

LB: Yeah. This in actual fact is, these as they get higher they get worse. This, as it gets higher is you are getting better.

DO6: So, we went backwards?

LB: Yeah, you got worse.

DO1: Did we?

LB: Not significantly, but you did.

DO2: And we got more worse...
LB: And you got more worse than the Control group.

DO3: I think that's because we recognised better what the problem was.

DO1: Well they're probably the people who aren't here, because they probably left

LB: No, but I got 13 out of 14 back remember?

DO4: So, what are the implications for an even longer term study? Cos, it's a bit like the argument that people use now that notification rates are on the increase. Well, that's not necessarily a bad thing. It could be that people are becoming better educated, and you would hope that in 5 or 10 years that things will drop, so if people are better able to identify it, and say "This is where I am", then you would hope that in some time after that there's some change and do something about recognition.

LB: Well, that's what I was hoping for. That's actually why I wanted to do this, not only because you deserve it, because you're really nice people, but also to find out what you think of the stats. Because, I can go and say, well, there was no change, therefore it was totally ineffectual, but I guess what I'm wanting to hear is whether it was totally ineffectual for you, in which case that's really important, or to hear if there are other things that need to be done, or what's your impression of what this means for you. Because you're the guys that filled it out. Yeah? In terms of what it means, just to... I can probably, here we are. Can you see that there on the side? There's your scoring. So, in terms of your Emotional Exhaustion, you rated in the high range, which is the same as it came out in Study 1, which is when I did all of Met North, and both groups, Control and Treatment were both in the high range, of the Emotional
Exhaustion range. Depersonalisation, they're in the moderate range, you guys are getting towards the high end of the range, that's your sense of detachment. And Personal Accomplishment, there is a sense of roughly that, yeah, for both of you, it's that high personal accomplishment. So, that means that you're actually feeling good about what you're doing. If you're trying to rate it, remember that this one is inversely related to this, so it actually means you've got quite high self-esteem if you like, a sense of positive thinking, a sense of feeling good about what you're doing. High emotional exhaustion, so you're strung out, and depersonalisation is that tendency to detach a bit more, in order to get through. But, what I'm interested in is whether or not that you think that's an accurate reflection. Because the other question that I had was "Does the scale that I've given you, measure how you feel?" Do you see what I mean? Because it's actually only numbers, and it's other people's ideas. So what I wanted to do, if you like, was go back through it, and you can do it for yourselves and say "Oh, maybe that's not how I feel", or "It is how I feel", or whatever.

DO2: I'm just looking at the figures here, the contrast between the Control group and the Treatment Group, and I guess you need to take into account the fact that people were not randomly allocated to those two groups, and we're here because we self-selected to be here. So, I'm just trying to feed you something for the discussion section!

LB: I think that that's really important. Although, interestingly, I think most people would have identified with this, rather than this, that most people would have felt more strung out, had up at the end of the day, than that sense of depersonalisation is not generally what people workers feel about themselves.
DO4: I don’t know, I don’t know that they can identify it pretty readily.

LB: Either they don’t identify it readily or they wouldn’t think it of themselves.

DO4: So is it easier to say “Oh yeah, I’m strung out and I can’t handle this anymore rather than to say don’t touch me?”

LB: I don’t know.

DO2: Well, I think that’s true, I think it is more kind of socially acceptable, if you like, to admit to being stressed and what have you, than you’ve hit a kind of low note.

LB: You’ve also got to remember that this is a mean, so this is an average, so you’re going to have maybe people who are more at one end and people who are less at the other. So it doesn’t mean you all scored in that range, that it’s just an average. But, what I looked at was because what came out was that there was no significant difference obviously between all this, and after I finished crying, a bit of weeping and wailing... they’ve just recently become unbandaged. I was really interested in, well OK, have I got 2 people who are faking good, or faking bad, that are blowing 14 peoples stats? Because of course, if you’ve got huge numbers if you get a couple of what they call outliers, so at very much at one end or the other it makes no difference, but otherwise it can skew your whole curves and all that sort of stuff. Well, I looked for it... there wasn’t. So, a bit more weeping, a bit more wailing...

DO3: I guess what that says to me, is, and I guess that’s been my experience, of most people that I work with, that although people are almost at their wits end, there’s still an element of caring for the clients that they work for and
because of that, they have a sense of "Well I will get joy out of that". So that they are at their wits end, and they will acknowledge it, but they still value the people, so that the depersonalisation stuff drops, because they still want to give whatever they have got left to those people, and I think that says something about the calibre of staff that are employed.

LB: It may also be that the reason that why the Treatment group was slightly higher in terms of that self-selection, if people were feeling slightly more strung out but it is reflected anyway in Emotional Exhaustion, and Depersonalisation is just another element of burnout. So, it just shows that there are often both of those. But it's interesting, that even going up, but still as you say, that Personal Accomplishment is really high, so people can feel good and feel competent.

DO2: Is it possible that just the experience of the workshop meant in fact that our scores increased, made it easier for us to, the second round of questionnaires made it easier for us to acknowledge the experience?

LB: What do the rest of you think?

DO5: I think "oh, definitely". I know the first time I did it, I was feeling really different to the second time I did it, and the second time I did it, I don't know whether it was because of the workshop or because of whatever, but I was actually a lot more negative in the second one, very much so, and I don't know whether that was because of what had happened at work, or because I'd been to the workshop, but I do remember thinking "Cor, I'm so much more negative than the first time I did it."

DO2: Are we suggesting the workshop made us negative?
DO6: Just made us more aware, I think.

DO7: I think it gave us license, to be more up front.

DO3: Because we recognised that we weren't the only ones that felt, it was OK to feel this way.

DO7: The first time some of us could have been a bit more conservative about putting on the table just exactly how we're feeling, so we developed our confidence by the end of that time.

LB: So, in a way, it's a bit of the old faking good on the first one, you know, "I'm not quite willing to be as honest about how bad this is", or else not having the awareness about "Oh, this is what it means. Yep, that's how I feel"? Oh, that's interesting isn't it?

DO4: Because I probably think that if you were wanting to do say, any work group in saying whether they were burnt out or something, and if that was something that they needed to address it, I'd suggest that they do a workshop, and then you talk about burnout and what you want to do. Because, until it's done, like there is not a lot of understanding, it's more like "This is where I am, and I'm feeling bad or low", or whatever it is, but after you've done the workshop you can have a, for me, it's a broader understanding of what's happening in burnout, and then you could come together as a group to do a "What are you going to do about it or what needs to happen".

DO7: You see the Department always pushes its' line when it does its' stress management education, but being burnt out is a much more of a superficial thing, if you try a bit harder to control your work, to control your time, then
you will overcome burnout, and off you go again. Whereas, you put a whole deeper meaning to the concept.

DO5: It's just typical isn't, it's just all put back on the worker, not on the establishment.

LB: Yeah, which then made me think about, well, if there was no change, and given that I mean that I think that there was a fair degree of confidence "OK, I'm going to go back and slog my workplace." What was it about the system that didn't allow change? Were there stuff that you did, I mean did you, you remember those personal plans?

DO4: I'm just hanging my head. I'm acting up at the moment...

DO8: Yeah, and he tells his staff they're as thick as two planks!

LB: So, that's a positive self-esteem building concept I take it?

DO1: Well, for instance, you know how we talked about those baby photos, and having that competition. So, I thought "Oh yeah, you know, I'll try that and sort of get everyone together" and when I mentioned it in a Team Meeting, the person that knocked it on the head and was really cynical and down about it was the manager! "Oh no, that's been tried before and it never works" And I went, "Well, I've just been to the workshop, and daddada", and we did it. You were one of the few that probably didn't put a photo in, but it was pretty good I reckon. It was a bit of a hoot, a bit of light hearted mucking about, and we did it the same day as a barbecue when we were getting rid of four wards from our office.
LB: I remember your celebration!

DO1: So, yeah, I thought that was OK.

LB: Oh, good. What happened to the personal plans on the whole? Did anyone even remember that they'd done them?

DO3: Well, I got a new job. That was one of my plans. I worked hard at that one. But, I think that was a result of the recognition that I was already at that point, but, and this is my interpretation of the results, doing the workshop didn't push me out, but it helped me to understand better the need for me to move on...

LB: Yep.

DO3: Because I wasn't going to be able to necessarily overcome...

LB: To effect change. Yep.

DO3: Just being where I was, and trying to do the stuff that I'd already tried before

DO4: I think that that's the added part about what you're saying, the first two parts are up high and then personal accomplishment, you're saying it's the characteristics of the helper being in there, that's probably what makes people hang in until they're dead! Instead of the recognition of saying "oh well, you know, you know it's not really me, or I've got to make some positive changes", it's this other part about "Well we're helpers, I know that if I quit now, well
we're sort of letting everybody down", so you just hang in and hang in until you're this burnt out wick. You know, because you can't recognise it.

LB: That's really interesting actually though, because it was the same within the first study, is that Emotional Exhaustion was really high, Depersonalisation was moderate for that study, but Personal Accomplishment was really high as well, and it was like, well it's not the classic burnout. What is it about us, that allows us to be little charred remains on probably the two most significant, but we still have a good sense about ourselves? I mean, that to me doesn't make a lot of sense. Anyone got any ideas?

DO1: Maybe we get support from each other, and that way we don't, we know that it's not us as individuals, it's the higher powers that is, something. Yeah, and we don't take it on board ourselves or something.

DO4: For me, for the most part, like I find District Officers are really unique or strange group of people, in that for the most part they're really confident people in themselves, like, because if you don't feel good about yourself you can't go out and continue to do what we do, you know. Like there would be more sexual assaults of our clients, there would be more complaints from our clients and stuff, because people would be taking advantage of the situation. That's what happens in other professions and stuff, so I think for the most part, DO's have to be fairly self confident and have a good sense of self-worth. So, maybe that's what gets you through all the rest of the stuff. In another group, in another profession, all of those things might be equal to make burn out more easily...

DO3: Because most of the work that we do, we don't get thanked for, I think as a skill, you've got to look for your own affirmation, you've got to look for it
yourself, because noone's going to bring it to you, and therefore we do, we look for it.

DO4: But even people who go and get other jobs, it's not like, "Oh, I'm burnt out, I'm so hopeless and useless, I can't do anything," and they go off on the dole or go off and do something else. For the most part, people go off to do other jobs where they still see themselves as being worthwhile, you know what I mean, it doesn't wear themselves down so they see themselves as being hopeless or useless people, they go off and do other things.

LB: Yeah, that's true, actually. Because they often then go to the private agencies, who they see as being able to value them, and so it's that sense of "I'll value myself, I'm just not getting recognition." Isn't that funny?

DO8: I wonder how much of it actually has to do with our client group, and the fact that our client group usually stuff up their lives more, make bad life decisions, have come from, have had poor parenting and so are poor parents, and are the victims of poor parenting. And they make us look pretty good.

DO4: It's like every time you hear about one of your friends dying of cancer, or a heart attack, you go 'Whew!! If it's 1 in 4, it's not me!!'

DO8: I actually think that that's maybe something valid to consider. That we're always dealing with people, who for the most time stuff themself or stuff their lives up, whether it's their own doing, or outside doing and we're always, nearly always coming in, to right something, to correct something, so, even...
DO4: I hope that we don’t feel that to feel good about ourselves? We need to hang around really hopeless people? We can’t afford to hang around people who feel really good about themselves!

LB: I don’t think I’ll include that bit!

DO2: Just to get back to the fact that both we and the Control group, self selected in for this, it occurs to me that, it is my subjective impression that there are people out there in DO land, who are, I would think a great deal higher on burnout and who also would rate much lower on Personal Accomplishment, I suspect maybe there is a major bunch out there who you haven’t tapped into because they have chosen not to be...

DO3: They’re so burnt out they didn’t make the time to do the questionnaire...

DO2: That’s right. Mmmm...

DO7: Or didn’t feel that motivated to be part of this at all.

DO4: Well, are these people do they want to do something about things? Like if you’re feeling burnt out, go on and do something.

LB: I mean, I had one person who actually approached me, who said “Look I’d really like to do it, but I’m a bit worried that it might take me into too much that I can’t deal with”. That their experience was such that they didn’t want to be embarrassed in front of a whole lot of their colleagues, a bit worried that it would take the thin veneer that was left, off.
DO7: We have about 5 or 6 people at our office that just as much wanted to do this course as what I did, and it was a matter of management saying "Look, sorry only one of you can go", and it was a of picking for straws, so there's definitely a lot more people out there that need this sort of similar...

LB: I had a couple of people who also contacted me and said "Please send along your handouts", which I said "OK, I don't know what good it will do you, but yeah", and they had the same problem with getting released.

DO5: So then, I guess the question for me is, if the results are showing that despite the fact that there was a workshop, and despite the fact that there was an intervention, the emotional exhaustion and the depersonalisation have gone up, then what does that mean? What does that mean for us, and for whoever else is coming into the job, to stop that from happening? Like are you going to be doing further research? About intervention? Like to actually stop the process? Or, what happens with it, like do you just deal with it?

LB: Well, this is, my question is... Do you actually feel that you benefited from the workshop? I mean do people feel that they didn't benefit from the workshop, because...

DO2: I think that you can, you proved statistically that there was no benefit at all!

LB: Yeah, you got worse!

DO2: However, the rest of the staff will look, you too could have your score go up 3 and a half points!
LB: Well, I guess I'm also interested from those of you who felt it didn't, it had no effect, it wasn't any good.

DO8: Can I just say, from my point of view, it had an effect, because it validated a lot of stuff that I would waft in and out of. So, I guess at a gut level I was managing my burnout, like I'd feel at the end of my tether and then whatever I'd do, I'd pull back or whatever I'd do, and then I'd cruise again for a while, and so it was like that, it was that sort of way. But, having come onto the workshop, I was more able to actually validate what my feelings were, and what the process that I was going through, and so when, like I'm CPO'ing [Community Programme Officer] at the moment, and when the opportunity came up, and it's all for the benefit of my last 3 months, which, you know, for all intents and purposes, I could have said "Well, you know, get someone whose going to do it full time", and I thought "Stuff it! You know, I've had enough, I want to do something for me, all these things go on for me, and a lot of the time I deny it or I don't deal with it, or I can't deal with it, because I think of all the other things, I'm going to go and do something that's going to be nice for me". So I've gone off and CPO'ed, and I guess the "loyalty versus me" pull actually pulled towards me rather than my loyalty, which I guess is maybe too bad to anyone, depending on who you are, but I actually think that this helped me look after me a bit more, and make decisions that were going to be better for me, and just say, "Well, managers, other staff are just going to have to get on with it, you know this is the real world, I'm going to do something for me". So for me, it validated some stuff and it helped me make some me decisions.

DO2: I certainly would say that the workshop was worthwhile, in that anything that improves understanding, awareness, self-awareness, ability to acknowledge and validate what's happening has got to be good and I really do
think that's what the change in this course is about. I don't think it got worse. I think we got greater awareness, and, things that were presented in the workshop for me made sense, you know there were some concepts, and some sort of frameworks that helped understand why situations that occur in the organisation, you know that niggle and nag.

LB: What sort of situations? Was it the organisational stuff?

DO2: The structural stuff. Yes, the organisational structural stuff. I mean that's just one thing that comes to mind immediately. I feel that I've, you know I didn't have a sort of a framework to understand that, and I've got a better understanding of that now. So, yeah, I don't think that the explanation for me was that it made me feel worse, or it got worse, it's about awareness.

DO4: Don't you think that the Department is suffering from burnout, not individuals? Because, you know I saw that what you gave to us needed to be offered to managers, not just staff, staff need to go and have more coping stuff, like I know that it's good to have an understanding, but if you're treating burnout in a unit say, it needed to be; staff go off and learn where they are and acknowledgement of that, but managers need to have better understanding, and then need to be treated as a group, because. So you needed to have like managers and the people that they supervise go off and do a workshop on burnout, and then the responsibilities for the managers is as much to work with those people in solving it, as expecting the people to do it, because this department would say "If you're burnt out, you go and do a burnout workshop, and you fix it up, and come back", and that seems really dumb. But the organisation itself needs to address it, to go to a burnout workshop and change.
DO7: So that the organisation is more aware perhaps?

DO4: Because yeah, like, we can go back as a group of people and you know, say that we had a good manager and a manager that we didn’t think was very good, but nothing, neither of those people changed.

DO1: Yeah, one left!

DO4: So, but if we go back saying “We see things in ourselves, or how we feel about burnout”, and the way we’re managed doesn’t change, then it’s not effective.

LB: Yeah, that's also what I was interested in. What were the limitations that people experienced? In terms of, you know, going back, and wanting to do something different? I mean, is it that the supervisors then didn’t let you change?

DO5: I think also, everyone else. You know you walk in really positive and with all this stuff, and yet other people who hadn’t done it was going “Yeah”. Because it wasn’t an office thing, and I think it’s really hard, whereas if everybody had walked in with that same really positive attitude, then I think that maybe things would have been, if only for a week, like it wouldn’t have mattered, but you just felt like as soon as you walked in you got shot down so...

DO7: It's a culture of the department, of pulling you back down. It's a very rigid framework of the department. It exists on that mentality for its own survival.
DO1: I think that you just get lost in it, you just get caught up in it. I've noticed when I've been on holidays, I tend to take mine in a big huge block so I tend to feel a lot better when I go back. And when I come back from leave I feel really good, like and when you walk in everyone's "blugh, blugh", it's really, really noticeable. After a while, like you feel good for a while, and then you get into that, and you see "blugh', and you end up "blugh" like everybody else, and you don't notice it, you don't notice what's going on, I just gradually "blugh', but when I've been on leave, I can come back and I can see it, everything's so "blugh', and down and 'blugh' and depressive...

DO4: For me, it made it seem, and what I thought was really bad as well, is that if you have 16 people working in an office, 16 DO's working in an office and you have one person, and particularly if that's a manager, that is ineffective or burnt out or doing wrong, the impact that that has, like that's really, really unfair that 16 people should suffer, and they do suffer, because of the behaviour or the inabilities of one person, and you just think, "That's a really stupid way for an organisation to work". You end up with 4 or 5 DO's leaving and you keep the person who's not being effective and the other people who are going to get burnt out and leave, all for the sake of this one person.

LB: Fascinating isn't it? So what sort of... I mean, in terms of future intervention, what sort of things would you recommend? I mean, obviously as you say, doing it with groups of people coming from different offices is not enough, and I think that we've got to pay attention to the stats in some ways, and say "Look! Hey, it's the big no change". What sort of things, while people feel as though, by the sounds of it, as though you've at least changed in some respects, what sort of, if it's going to be effective in actually reducing burnout. What would you suggest?
DO6: I can recommend to the powers that be not to waste thousands, tens of thousands of dollars on recruitment and to start concentrating on the good people that are already here, instead of going through the process, after 12 months they piss off, because they're sick to death of it, and then they get a whole new swag of people here. I don't know why.

DO4: Yeah, well to use this information in recruitment. That's interesting for me, I've just been the contact person in the Nepean Area for the last bulk recruitment, and we've had like, I think 1700 responses, I think they've had, it was well over 1200 and that was on Monday. There have been like, I think 5-700 applications for 70 jobs. So, it is an enormous response, and to hear the people ringing up saying "Oh, I always wanted to be a DO", and you go, and they've no idea what it's about, and I think "Gees, this is where we need to start. These people are setting themselves up to be burnt out very quickly", because you say, "Do you know what it's like to work in a bureaucracy?", "Oh no, but I really want to be a DO, I want to help people."

DO1: "I want to help people." "I want to save the world."

DO4: ... and you're "Oh, come on!" So, I agree with DO6, that hanging on to people that we've got is a good idea, but we also need to use what you've done back at recruitment, and bring up about qualifications. I've had these big discussions, because people ring up, and they've given you a list of about 6 qualifications that you can have, and obviously there are dozens and dozens of qualifications, so people ring up and say "I've got this background", and you say, "I'm sorry, it doesn't meet the criteria." and then they say "Oh, but I did this study or this study". So you ring up Industrial Relations, who say "Oh well, it might or it might not be", and then you'll get in Staff Development who says, "Oh yeah, tell them to put it in, because they sound like a good
applicant." And so there's this argument about whether everyone has to have a Social Work degree from Sydney Uni, or whether they can be other people, other things, and other life experiences to come in and, to my mind, it's silly recruiting from this group.

LB: So the colour's there, but it doesn't mean that you’ll get the staff that you want

DO4: Doesn't mean that you’ll get staff that are going to stay or are satisfied, or who can handle the job to start with.

LB: The Human Resources figures are that we lose 22% of our staff in their first year.

DO5: That really baffles me. To think, they pay $50,000 to train every DO now. I just finished GELT, and that's 50,000 each, and I've been there for 18 months, and I'm ready to go. I really am, I'm ready to go. And there are 4 or 5 people in the office that are ready to split as well and you think “The managers see that, and they don’t work to rectify anything”. You know what I mean? It's like "No, you're not going because you need to stay here", but, if you're forced to stay in a place where you don't want to stay, you're not going to work, then you're not going to do your best, it's terrible. I just think, "I can't believe that they spend so much money, and I've been there for this short time, and I think well, I can't be burnt out, but I just need to go."

DO4: It is actually terrible, I'm acting AM [Assistant Manager] at the moment, and I'll use DO5, especially as she's raised herself as an example, but that's where it needs to be addressed, rather than just in our unit, because we say "Oh, we've trained this person, a good worker, whose got lots of
potential”. But that’s a contradiction, if I know it’s a good worker whose got lots of potential, they’re not going to stay! That’s the really dumb part, why I would I expect that DO5’s going to hang around and be a DO for the next 5 years. She’s not going to do that, but as a department, why lose that? So why say “Oh well, we’ve trained her to be a DO, $50,00, and now she’s going to go after 12 months”. That’s dumb, you know, there are positions coming up that I know that DO5 wants to do, for a few days a week or even full time. Why not use that as a progression? If the department doesn’t lose this person, we lose a DO’s position, but we can get another one...

DO7: But you would have lost her anyway...

DO4: Yeah, if you’re going to go to another organisation and leave us altogether, or we provide avenues for people to do other things, to keep them interested, and interesting.

LB: But what is it about the time of needing to go after 18 months?

DO4: Well, it could be lots. You get people out of University, and for some people they’re going to save for the first 12 months and travel.

DO5: I think I was one of those people that would have rung up and said “Look, I’ve always wanted to be a DO”. And never knew. At uni, it was “Oh, to be a DO, would just be fantastic”, and everybody wanted to be a DO. And that’s what I came in as, thinking that that would give me a good basis, and I don’t doubt that it has, I think it has. But just the, the not really knowing, but putting the job application in and not knowing what you’re in for, that’s what I was saying to DO4, for the recruitment. It would be really useful if we could have, like an information night for people that are applying. Get some DO’s to
say, "Look, this is what it's like". It gives them experience, it gives them whatever it is, to try and get them more into the personal stuff, not just into the framework of the department, but into what it means for an individual to work as a DO. So, I mean, if I would have known that, I think that I would have reconsidered.

DO1: It's the same as foster parents, it's like a lot of foster parents, I guess you don't know until you actually do it yet, like people can tell you and tell you and tell you but...

DO4: The other part is, don't train people for 12 months. Some people come in, do the job for 12 months and don't provide them with training and then, if they leave, you haven't wasted the money on training them, you train them after 12 months because they're more likely to stay around.

LB: But then, don't you think also, that their rate of burnout is higher because they haven't been trained? They're working from gut.

DO4: That would be interesting, but I don't know that that's true. I accept that if they're not trained and that they start to do things from behind. Like, that's where you see people come in to the office on the first day and expect to do things, and the frustration builds from there. It might, or it might not work, but their enthusiasm might keep them going for 12 months. But that would be interesting to get some information about that.

DO3: There has to be the recognition I think, that it doesn't necessarily matter what you do as far as training, recruiting, whatever, the nature of the work that we do, the very nature of it, we're not going to change it because there are kids who are being abused, and we're going to have to deal with that,
and I think that recognising that and validating people's feelings, that it's OK sometimes to feel like you're at your wits end, it's OK sometimes to not have the answer, you know, it's OK to have a break sometimes. And if that is developed as part of our job, the fact is, the quality of staff will just increase. Like I don't think that because our results show that our group, you know, the Treatment group got worse, I don't think that that means that we have become worse, I think that it means that we have become better, at what we do, because we can look after ourselves. We can say "Hey there's a problem here, let's try and work at it" and if we can't that's OK, it's not just me, and that sort of stuff. And that's going to have to raise the quality of work, and the quality of staff.

DO5: I think, it's really minimised, the reality of the job, the effects that it can have on you, especially in training. It's very much said to you, that "Well you know you might be feeling this way now, but with lots of experience you won't feel that way", and that's not the case and...

DO8: Just wait till you start to feel depersonalised and you won't feel anything!

DO5: ...and you'd say to the trainers, "...But that's really common", and they'd say "Well that's because you've only just started, and that's because you're only 22", and that type of thing. And you think "What am I doing here?" Why even start if from the beginning you're told that "You're not going to feel good until you're about 40". Do you know what I mean like? To me, that's like a long time away. So I think "Shit". So it is minimised.

LB: ...and by the time you're 40, you don't even expect to feel good about anything!
DO1: Does it get better by the time you’re 40? Cos I’m nearly there!

LB: No, go on DO5, I’m sorry.

DO5: No, it’s just, I’ve got a real thing about the training, I found it really inadequate. I was in the field for 8 months before I started the training, and I found it completely inadequate, really not based on what we do at all, just based on this fantasy about what it’s supposed to be like, and then you go in there and you get people there that haven’t actually been in the field that have just gone straight into training and “Oh wow, yes, excellent, I love this job”, and you go “No, just wait till you get…”, and it’s really not reality, so people are going in there expecting a lot, and you expect so much, and then it doesn’t happen, and you think “Oh God” ‘cos your expectations have been built to the stage where you think “Oh, it’s going to be like this and things are going to work out”, and your first day on the job they don’t, and you think “God!”...

DO7: …and you’re so disillusioned.

DO1: Plus too, why do we do the training when everyone’s got qualifications? Like, unless it’s just specific type how to fill in this form or whose this person in the department, or, how do you get what you need. Not oh yeah, you hear a child crying. I mean, I don’t know if it’s changed a lot, but it was really dumb when I did it.

DO4: I was the same. I thought that the one workshop that they needed was “How do you get the money that you want for things”, and we never did that workshop, and that was a time when they were really tight with stuff and I thought “I can figure out the legislation, I can figure out all these things, I want to know how to get the money when I want to do things.”
LB: How to write a submission?

DO1: Yeah, practical things, not the bullshit stuff that everyone’s been trained in, you know, specific to our department, how do you get this, or how do you do that, not how do you talk to someone about sex.

DO5: I mean, they go through family assessment stuff that you probably would have done anyway before, and for every topic; drug and alcohol, non English speaking background, mental health, disability, they would go through family assessment time after time in a different context, and you’d think, “Well, I’ve got it, I know it, let’s go onto something a little more practical, like how to engage the families in starting a family assessment, how to bring the topic up”. Stuff like that was never done, it was just a rehash of uni, and very little, like just the top, basic stuff.

LB: What would you, I mean training is one of the things, I was supposed to meet with Greg O’Reilly, but he cancelled the appointment. I was supposed to meet with Greg, and I said to him “Some of the feedback from the workshop was that training is really unrealistic”, and he said to me “Yes, but it’s a constant dilemma we have about…” and I said that the feedback was that it was sort of ivory tower stuff, as compared to the reality of the job, and he said, “But what are we supposed to do? Train people in worst practise, instead of best practise?” And, I guess that that was one of the questions I was wanting to ask you was “What sort of training, I mean if there’s going to be this big, you know, GELT also known as DOCAP, and just the same as it always was, what sort of things could you make as suggestions that, do you think would help?

DO3: Well, I think that we should go back to just simple acknowledgement stuff. That if there’s a minimum requirement that someone has to have before
they take on the job, stuff like child development, they need to know child
development, but they don’t have to go to DO training course to learn that.
They should know family assessment models whatever, people should know
that, and if they don’t know that then the qualifications that people are seeking
to do the job are inadequate because if they’re the sort of things. It’s like, if you
go for a computer job and you don’t know what a keyboard is, it’s like, “We’re
going to teach you what a keyboard is” because you know what a keyboard is,
because that’s what you’re trained in.

DO1: But you maybe need to know the particular system on that computer,
whatever that might...

DO3: Yeah, yeah. And if you don’t, but you still have the ability to learn it,
that’s fine, but as far as the basic training for a District Officer goes, they
should, should know that.

LB: So basically what you’re talking about is that although they’ve upped
the qualification criteria, that in actual fact they’re still teaching to the lowest
common denominator which is even less than it used to be. So, I mean, do you
think that 3 months is too long for GELT?

DO4: It goes on for bloody years!!

DO5: Yeah, now they’re only doing a week block and then 5 weeks out.

DO4: We’ve got someone who’s starting now and she won’t be finished until
March, so it just goes on forever.
DO1: It's because the 12 months might be up, and she might be out by then and then they don't have to waste money!

LB: Save 3 grand on the last month!

DO4: I agree with Greg in that, in that there has to be best practises, and when you see the changes just office to office in the one Area, and that's not across the State, that's really bad, and then when we get a case where we go to court and there's some criticism of our practices, then as a department we need to address that, so people do need to go and do a legislation workshop, and they do need to go and do interviewing children, and they do need to do things quite specific, but yeah, that's about it I reckon.

CHANGE SIDES OF TAPE

DO3: The first three months everyone does a weeks training on a particular thing and then in three month's do a bit of training in advanced practice and so it becomes an ongoing career development training.

DO6: ...dragging it out, it needs to be ongoing, not just one block and then you finish it.

DO3: ...and if you modify it, like what Lucy said, what DOCAP which is the whole GELT course which you just used to go, do a few lectures and finish, they've just, they've kept that, where initially that needs to be revised, so that they're not teaching basic stuff that everyone should know already, otherwise what did you study at Uni for? Just bring someone off the street, I mean there's got to be a recognition of that.
LB: I think that there has also has to be a recognition that some people that because we do take on a variety of disciplines that they’re not going to have the same training, but I think that to cover family assessment in a half day or in a day, on the basis that “Okay, it may be really boring for some of you, but here it is”, and then, “But you’re all intelligent people who’ve gone through uni, so we’re only going to do it once, and we’ll give you handouts, and when you’re back in your office you can figure it out yourselves”, or talk to other people who have also done it, is better than doing it 4 times. You know, and then, or even doing a half day on the model, and then a half day on NESB, disabilities you know, all those things, as to how they fit into that model.

DO3: I teach at TAFE and one of the subjects is Child Protection and its for the Certificate in Welfare course which is a departmental qualification to be a DO, and that’s a basic TAFE course, Child Protection. And what we want is to fine tune specific skills, like the relevant legislation, like the format that we use to assess a family, so that we can put all the details on the computer. Like those sorts of things need to be covered, but, if we’re getting qualified people, we’re getting people generally who have brains, people with common sense, and need to affirm people in those skills, not deplete them and take away from them.

DO2: Ideally, that’s what that DO competency document should be sort of about. That should ultimately end up in a significant rethink of how our training is structured and how the ongoing training is structured, because there are several sort of levels.

DO4: What I want to ask is how do you get the next increment now? Supposedly because you have reached a certain set of competencies and you’ve had a period of 12 months supervision. That’s right, because the
supervisor signed their signature on your reference, on your form, and if you've been told that where people have been challenged, then they've been directed to sign it. It's not worth the hassle of not giving someone their increment, where your increment is supposedly a review to say that you've reached the next set of competencies. So they already have it, they're just calling it something else and putting competencies along side it.

DO3: But that, that's where Ongoing Career Development Training should come in. I think before you get your increment, you should do level four of the training of DOCAP, and that's where you need to incorporate it, and if you don't do level 4 training, you don't get your increment. Because even though you may know it... it's like computer people, I teach computer training. People come along, and they've used a computer for months, but it's that one little thing that they pick up at the training, just the one other thing that they pick up, you know that makes them feel like that or maybe they understand it a bit better, like how it works, just simple things that they pick up, that they've been doing all along, and it helps to fine tune their skills and learn what they're doing. That they're doing the right thing. And that supervision and stuff is just basic.

DO7: I think, incorporated in that advanced DOCAP, which you do every 2 years or so, where you go out again for another few months or whatever, commute between either Kamballa or Glebe or whatever, but intertwined into that, that you have the sort of training that you've been doing like with us as well. That's talking about where you are personally, combined with having a deeper understanding as to your role as a DO. And it's also giving you valuable time out. If you're out of the office for the length of time that DOCAP does now, and I would see it as a pat on the back that "Yes you've survived 2 years, 4 years, whatever, we will now push some more information into you,
and skill you up even more, and also reward you by giving you some more training”.

LB: One of the difficulties that they've found with training, I was talking to Milka, was that in actual fact Care & Protection people don't come.

DO7: Because they're so busy!

DO4: You don't get a chance!

LB: Yet you're all here...

DO4: But only because you're doing it, the only courses we see that come through are the ones that are offered by outside organisations that are worth hundreds of dollars, and they say “Oh here’s a course on such and such, oh its worth 300 dollars”, and they just put it down.

LB: What about the Staff Devel. programme?

DO6: We didn't get it for this half of the year.

DO7: There wasn't one that was put out

DO3: I think there were 3 courses for Child Protection, one was at Bidura, it was very good, it was fun, but it was limited to like 15 people.

DO8: I actually think that the structure that we work in sabotages training, because DO’s are normally so busy doing Child Protection that they’re constantly focussed on the urgent, and they can’t focus on the important, and I
think the structure, I think managers, need to take responsibility for building in training time. Because at the moment it's actually up to the DO, and when you are past your eyeballs in work, the last thing you think of is taking 3 days out, to go to Bidura, yeah that's right, stuff doesn't get taken off you, you're likely to find Child Protection CAR's in your "IN" tray when you come in that you know are Priority 2's and you've been off for 3 days, and I just think that the whole system that we have for people in Child Protection sabotages training and I think there needs to be a rethink of the way managers build in training or the department builds in training, rather than just you know "Put up your hand if you're free". DO's aren't ever free.

DO2: ...and I think there is a culture that it is a kind of optional extra luxury as opposed to necessary.

DO7: ...and it's only if you're up to date with your work, if you haven't got a court report due or whatever, but then yes, maybe you can go to training.

DO2: ...and it's very expendable.

DO3: Or if you're strong enough, or able to recognise that you can actually say it is more important that I have 3 days out than stay here at this computer, it is more important, and as individuals we are discovering how to make changes, and learning how to make changes, and this is why this burnout feedback stuff is very valuable, to say, well at least it will have that to empower people to have that responsibility and to be okay about it.

DO4: Yeah that's what I was saying and I agree with DO8, I think that there's a lot more responsibility on the managers to be able to do that. It's changing what's urgent and what's important because particularly in Child...
Protection, the whole thing is focussed on urgency, rather than importance, and there are these, lots of articles coming through now, with some places unallocated Category 3's, you know after 3 months, no repercussions, so what's important and what's urgent! And there's this thing about that because you set in train a particular process that you are required to follow through regardless of what the outcome is, so if you get a notification, if someone comes up to me, or if someone called me about this and I say "Don't worry about that, put it on paper, it's not important, just forget it", but that's different, and if the next person actually takes the same information and put it on as a notification, and then it comes to me, and I've got to make the decision to screen it out or give it a rating. If I give it a rating, well once that happens, there's this process that has to go on, regardless of whether it's needed or not. It has to be done, someone has to go out and do an interview, if they do the interview, then they've got to put the assessment on in 28 days, and all for what? When the same piece of information could have been discarded, and that's, we're really stupid about how we work and what we do.

LB: So, if we were going to look at organisational things, I mean if I'm going to come up with this beautiful prototype, that you've all thought of, for what we could do to reduce burnout, it would be, would you include this as part of the things for DO's to do, to at least increase their awareness as one of a function of things, then the second thing would be recruitment, well the first thing would be recruitment, for managers to do the burnout stuff...

DO1: 8 weeks compulsory leave a year.

DO4: I think there should be some discretionary leave as well for our managers and staff to work out together, so if someone says "I'm not particularly ill, but I'm not particularly well" then the manager says "It's OK,
take a couple of days off over the weekend and don't come in". Because if you say it's sick leave or stress leave, then there's again there's this process that you have to go through to justify what you're doing or someone is labelled as not coping, whereas if you can say "I acknowledge that the work that you've done this week has been particularly difficult, don't come in tomorrow", and if you can do that 5 days a week, 5 times a year, you know it's like, I think it's time well used.

DO3: I see burnout training as being different levels of training with the first type of burnout training being "This is what burnout is: Things to be aware of", then several months, or a year later, come back, "This is what we talked about in Burnout 1, this is Burnout 2, where are you up to now?" To give people a chance to sort of evaluate, so that initially they've got the chance to try and deal with it, but because of the nature of our work and all that sort of stuff rather than "Oh, you've done the burnout workshop that's it". So the calm and the carer, and then so you have 3 months this year, and then maybe a year later you can have Burnout 3 and then Burnout 4. That sort of programme.

DO4: I think there should be some workshops where managers attend with the staff they supervise, so that someone else gets to analyse the interactions between that person and their staff and to offer criticism and develop ways of doing things a bit like the Proma personality type questions that you can do. You can get a group of people together who are going to work together and you do personality types like with people who are working, I did one of those when we were working on a project. Right from the start it was just so much better how you understood how other people thought and used information. So if you could have a manager attend with 5 or 6 people that they supervise and then you could, it's clear from both people what's expected and what can be given, and the ideas that could be used to address things and it tells you
about how to get feedback, as a manager I find it almost impossible how to get good, honest feedback from people that you’re working with. That you have to get it from other ways and well, you have to make interpretative stuff about that. I guess good managers can do that, but as a novice, I find that really difficult and that soliciting feedback is hard to get to be able to change what you’re doing or not doing right. So if you had someone else, where you attended a workshop, they could say “How do you deal with these situations?” or even more basic like how you set up systems with them about supervision, about giving and getting feedback.

LB: And would you recommend doing that say with a supervisor and the 5,6,7 people that they supervise under them, as compared to taking a whole unit?

DO4: Yeah, that might be a good idea, I just for me, at the moment, I don’t have to supervise 6 or 7 other people in the office, but I am responsible for this other group, so I think that a workshop together with a supervisor, like even when I’m as a DO, to be able to go along with your manager and to be able to sit down and work out how are we going to communicate, that’s about all it is I guess, for the next period of time. It would make things a lot easier.

DO5: I have some reservations about how or whether that would work, I know that for me, and at the moment with DO4 it would work, but DO4 wasn’t my previous supervisor, I could never sit there and tell her, because I couldn’t, you couldn’t, because there was so much stuff you would end up being really rude! But I think that it’s how you feel with your manager as well, if you’re feeling like it’s been going on for so long and you haven’t been listened to, then you’re not likely to come along and say “Oh this is what I want”. Anyway, that’s how I feel, I don’t think it’s being trivialised, I don’t think it’s being as truthful as you would like to be, whereas if you’re feeling comfortable with
your manager you can say whatever and that would feel OK, but it would be hard to get a hold of people that feel comfortable with their supervisor, and therefore would be honest.

LB: I think in some ways though, I mean the way that I see it is, having seen a couple of dysfunctional offices from the outside, is that you’re probably better off with one manager and their small group of people.

DO2: ...and one from the inside!

LB: Well yes... And that you’re probably better off doing it with that because it’s less people, less dynamic, and the managers let, is not being looked at by another manager as well, but that it then does become about teamwork, but then what you require is a really good facilitator, and somebody who has got insight and guts to talk about “Well, it seems we’ve got a couple of really big silences going on here. What does that mean?”, and then some really good structured work to do together, in order to get that going, like those personality sort of and team work stuff that they do in other big organisations.

DO1: Given though that we work with drama and stress and crisis and like emotionally charged situations, day in, day out, you would think that we would get more holidays than 4 weeks a year, like to get over some of that emotional exhaustion or like I know I take 4 weeks at a certain time of the year, and that only does me like 7 months and then from there I’m sort of plodding, and then by the time my holidays come around again I’m like “blugh”.

DO7: Yeah, you collapse in the first week anyway.
DO1: ...and like if there was just a couple of weeks at the end of the year as well, to sort of, or you know, half way, at that 7 month mark, I don't know, but I can't take just 2 weeks here and 2 weeks there either, I just start to relax and I've got to go back to work again. I really need 4 weeks to completely switch off and get into something else in a completely different frame of mind.

LB: Well, the Res. Care workers get 6 weeks a year.

DO7: Because of their shift work.

LB: ...and that's the same with cops. But, I think it's worth putting up as a proposal, and I mean at one stage they were even looking at giving us flexis every 2 weeks, instead of every 4.

DO3: I think you'd be working as hard, I mean under the current system you work the work time, and it's just a simple acknowledgement of what we put in. It's not that we are sitting at the office providing reports, most of the time that we have to work back, most of the time we're working with families with people who work and don't get home until 5 o'clock.

DO1: But even one day a week, like that flex day is nice to have, but it doesn't, but my frame of mind doesn't go back to normal, it still stays work mode type...

DO4: Even though you've got the day off, you stand in the shower thinking about work, and "How am I going to do that?"

DO1: But if you could have like an extended period of time, that's what I find. I don't know if other people are like that, but I become a different person,
I have a totally different outlook to things. That's why I have to take 4 weeks, I wish that I had taken 5 weeks, I had 5 weeks... and at the end of this year I've got long service leave as well!

DO7: But I think that if the department's serious about the concept of Occ. Health and Safety that it would build this preventative sort of stuff into supporting DO's, at the preventative end rather than reacting at the other end, for the DOs, but it just shows that the department hasn't got the resources or the sincerity to draw all that on board.

DO1: Yeah, but it's impossible to keep people though.

LB: So if we looked at say recruitment as being one of those factors whereby if you recruit from people with a diversity of ranges and sort of disciplines I suppose...

DO4: You were also saying that like one of the things you said about burnout was personal attributes.

LB: Yeah, so looking at skill building with some of those attributes and actually skill definition, or selection on the basis of attributes, and then look at doing your training somewhat closer than the year mark, maybe, and then making the training more relevant, and concise, and then ongoing training from there on a yearly basis and including the burnout information in that initial training and then with your ongoing training also including then skill building I suppose with that, and then training your managers in what burnout is as well, then would we be getting anywhere closer?
DO3: I think if we’re also not focussing on the prevention of burnout because I think what that did for me, I think that that’s the wrong framework, because we’re not going to prevent burnout. We can reduce it, we can reduce the incidence, but actually recognise that because of the nature of the work there are going to be times when people are burnt out and have had burnout, they just happen to be in burnout mode and you could actually get to a point where this is this preventative model taking on, I think that that will decrease the numbers “I’m an absolute failure, I didn’t pass the Burnout course, because I wasn’t able to prevent it!” But what I learnt from that definition you put up initially, was that it creeps up on you basically, and I had a smile because I got it, it’s a continuum and some days you are more burnt out than others.

LB: I think that that’s really true, and I think that you have to validate, but it’s also cyclical, I mean I think that there are times where you can pinpoint “God, that was a bad month for me”, or a bad couple of months, you know it was a really rough phase, and particularly if something in your personal life was shitty at the same time, it’s just like “I don’t know if I want to keep breathing”, but then you come back out the other side and things pick up as well. Is there anything else that we should discuss?

DO8: I think the managers programmes should be twofold, I think that it should be so that managers can recognise burnout in themselves, and so that managers can recommend, can recognise and assist staff when they notice staff burning out, so like both, one so that they don’t burn out themselves, or they can recognise burnout themselves, but also so that they can look after their staff, so two different focuses, two separate courses, burnout for yourself, burnout for... managing burnout for staff
LB: I think also that there has to be that recognition of just their responsibility for their staff, but also, yeah as you say, I think that a lot of managers would like to recognise it in their staff as long as they don't have to look at themselves.

DO4: Or if they don't have to address it, just recognise it. Recognise “Oh, that person's burnt out”, but they have no idea what to do with it.

DO1: But when the DO's look at some of the managers, it's like they're burnt out, it's fucked!

LB: I think that it's probably about time to wind up...
Dear

BURNOUT WORKSHOP FEEDBACK

Just when you thought that you had heard the last from me...

I have finished the data analysis and would like to give you, the groovy workshop participants, some feedback on the results of the research. At the same time, I would like to gain your opinions as to what was useful and what wasn't, to incorporate into my thesis.

So, if you would like to come along and hear how it all panned out, and perhaps partake of a little morning tea, then be at...

WHERE: Kamballa (same room as last time)

WHEN: Monday, 13th November, 10am - 11:30am

Could you please fill in the little blurb below and let me know if you are coming or not, so that I can organise appropriate catering...

See you there!!

Lucy Blunt

I can/cannot (cross out one) attend the Burnout Workshop feedback on Monday, 13th November at Kamballa, 10am - 11:30am

NAME: ________________________________

CENTRE: _______________________________