

Running head: Burnout

Burnout Among
Licensed Master Level Social Workers in Maine

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF SOCIAL WORK

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

BY

JESSE H. BABCOCK III

2003

The University of Southern Maine

_____ 2003

We hereby recommend that the thesis of **Jesse H. Babcock III** entitled:

Burnout Among Licensed Master Level Social Workers in Maine

Be accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Social Work.

Committee:

Lacey Sloan, PhD

Chairperson

Paul Johnson, DSW, LCSW

Elizabeth KimJin Traver, PhD

Accepted:

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my research committee, Dr. Lacey Sloan (chair), Dr. Paul Johnson, and Dr. Elizabeth KimJin Traver. Without these three people this thesis would not have been possible. I would like to thank Dr. Vincent Faherty for giving me the basics to start research. I would also like to thank the USM MSW class of 2003 for giving me the encouragement to take on this enormous project. Finally I would like to thank all the Maine Social Workers who participated in this study, thank you for taking the time of open up your world and allowing me to analyze these particulars.

Abstract

Burnout is an occasion of job and life related exhaustion resulting in selective job termination, mental and physical health concerns, relationship problems, and the possibility of other issues. Burnout not only affects the individual, but can also affect others around a burnt-out individual; for example the clientele, organization, family, friends, and society.

The sampling frame for this exploratory study was Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers, the observation unit included 600 Social Workers gathered randomly from a list provided by the state of Maine Office of Licensing and Registration. This was a one-time mail out survey, which produced 208 usable responses to the questionnaire packet. This provided an adequate return rate of 35%. The statistical analysis used, included frequencies, measures of dispersion, measures of central tendency, correlations, multiple regression analysis, and cross tabulation.

Utilized in this study were two instruments to measure levels of burnout, a third to measure alleviation and preventative factors, and a demographics instrument. Respondents scored well on Burnout Instruments 1 and 2, with no one scoring in the high burnout range and only 14-25% scoring in the mid-ranges. Also included in Instrument 2 were subscales of which there were some high scoring areas, these included, conflict, poor feedback, and ambiguity. Correlation and regression analysis revealed significant individual prevention factors that included scheduled vacations, setting realistic goals, colleague support, and accentuating the positive. Significant organizational factors of prevention of burnout included, employee acknowledgement and empowering employees. Respondents claimed they received scheduled supervision, but it did not register as having a great impact on lowering the level of burnout. Age was a factor, as respondents age increased their level of burnout decreased, the longer respondents have had their master's level licenses the lower their burnout score, and the longer respondents have spent in their current concentration the lower their burnout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Final Approval Form	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	v
Chapter 1 Social Problem	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	3
Chapter 3 Methods	9
Research Questions	9
Population and Sampling	10
Data Collection	10
Instruments	11
Data Analysis	13
Chapter 4 Findings	15
Response Rate	15
Demographics	15
Prevalence of Burnout	16
Prevention and Alleviation of Burnout	17
Risk and Ameliorative Factors Associated with Burnout	18
Chapter 5 Discussion	33
What is the prevalence?	33
What are professionals doing?	33
What are organizations doing?	34

What are the risk and ameliorative factors?	34
Limitations	36
Implications	36
Conclusions	38
Appendix A	43
Questionnaire Packet	
Instrument 1 “Am I Burning Out”	43
Instrument 2 “Burnout Potential Inventory”	44
Instrument 3 “Prevention and Alleviation of Burnout”	45
Instrument 4 “Demographics”	46
USM request for study exemption from IRB review	47
USM Notice of Evaluation-Exemption from IRB review	48
Copyright permission for Instruments 1 & 2	49
Appendix B	50
Tables	
1.1 Present Social Work Practice	50
1.2 Previous Social Work Practice	51
1.3 Gender	52
1.4 Ethnicity	53
1.5 Marital Status	54
1.6 Salary	55
1.7 Average Hours in Work Week	56
2.1 Burnout Totals According to Instrument 1	57
2.2 Burnout Totals According to Instrument 2	58

2.3 Subscale Totals from Instrument 2	59
2.4 Individual Alleviation Techniques Totals	60
2.5 Organizational Alleviation Techniques Totals	61
3.1 Regression Analysis between Burnout Instruments and Individual Alleviation Techniques	62
3.2 Regression Analysis between Burnout Instruments and Individual Alleviation Techniques	63
4.1 Total Alleviation/Prevention Skills Applied by Individuals	64
4.2 Total Alleviation/Prevention Skills Applied by Organizations	65
References	66

Chapter 1: Social Problem

“Social workers are considered an occupational group at above-average risk for burnout.” (Soderfeldt & Soderfeldt, 1995, p. 638). Loosely defined Social Worker burnout is an occasion of job and life related exhaustion resulting in selective job termination, mental and physical health concerns, relationship problems, and the possibility of other issues. This exploratory study concentrated on the current prevalence and risk and ameliorative factors associated with burnout among Social Workers in the state of Maine. Burnout not only affects the individual, but also can affect many others around that individual. In Social Work, burnout affects the quality of care, relationships, and effectiveness of care towards clientele. Burnout also affects organizations by way of employment status, organizational reputation, and ultimately service provider numbers (i.e. having fewer employees to handle caseloads). This in turn indirectly affects clients as well. The results of this study are intended to help the individual Social Workers, organizations, schools of Social Work, and government of Maine realize the issues of burnout as it relates to Maine. Because the investigation of the past and current literature seemed to reveal very little written about rural Social Worker burnout and nothing written concerning burnout among Maine Social Workers, this research will add to knowledge base needed to maintain low turnover rates among rurally spread out Social Workers and organizations. Maine is experiencing inadequate numbers of Social Workers (personal communication, April 29, 2003, Rep. M Laverriere-Boucher), so it is essential to do anything we can to keep Social Workers in Maine, if we can find ways to offer attractive employment that is sensitive to needs of Social Workers, we may be able to meet the demand for Social Workers. Because of the cost of training, Maine organizations want to retain

Social Workers, so it is important for Social Workers and organizations to understand the possibilities and issues of burnout and effective ways of prevention. With this understanding organizations and Social Workers will have the tools necessary to prevent burnout, therefore retaining Social Workers in Maine organizations.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Initially burnout was a term used to describe a person who was suffering the effects of major drug abuse. In 1974 Freudenberger applied the term burnout to the psychological state of workers at an alternative health care agency and gave the definition of an idealistic overachiever “fatigued” and/or frustrated. (as cited in Farber, 1983; Grosh, & Olsen, 1994; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Skovholt, 2001; Soderfeldt, Soderfeldt, & Warg, 1995) While Freudenberger’s research tended to focus on the state of the individual; Maslach (1982) focuses on the “situation”, the relationship, and the organization. Maslach & Jackson (1981) define burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind. A key aspect of the burnout syndrome is increased feelings of emotional exhaustion” (as cited in Soderfeldt, et al., 1995). This definition seems to be the most descriptive without becoming too technical. Many other definitions have been offered over the past 27 years; most of them include: emotional exhaustion, cynicism, low morale, insomnia, depersonalization, reduced accomplishment, lowered productivity, loss of feeling for clients, and physical depletion. (Arches, 1991; Farber, 1983; Gillespie, 1987; Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1998; Gomez & Michaelis, 1995; Justice, Gold, & Klein, 1981; Koeske & Koeske, 1989; Maslach, 1982; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Poulin & Walter, 1993; Skovholt, 2001; Soderfeldt, et al., 1995). All of the definitions, offered in the literature, involve negative reactions from and towards work.

Developed in 1981, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is a measurement tool to evaluate “people’s experience of burnout” (Maslach, 1982, p. 8). The Maslach

Burnout Inventory (MBI) has 22 items that are broken down into three “core dimensions” which include “emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment” (Maslach, 1987, p. 102). Currently the MBI is in its third edition and has different formats for different types of work; i.e. “the MBI-Human Services Survey, the MBI-Educators Survey, and the MBI General Survey [for studies in non-] people oriented [fields]” (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 402). The MBI is used or referenced in almost every article or text referenced in this review. Only one other major measurement tool has been developed, The Pines Tedium Scale (PTS). The PTS measures “physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion...from 21 different experiences” (Soderfeldt, et al., 1995, p. 640) The MBI is much more widely used than the PTS, as the PTS is only referenced in a few of the articles researched. (Pines, 1993; see also Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1998; Grosh & Olsen, 1994; Justice et al., 1981; Soderfeldt et al., 1995)

“Burnout is an individual experience that is specific to the work context” (Maslach, et al. 2001, p. 407). What may make one person truly satisfied may ‘burn’ someone else out. “Client or work overload, ...role conflict or ambiguity, ...severity of clients, ...absence of recourses, ...lack of supervisory or social support, ...lack of information, ...control or decision making” are all important factors that may increase burnout (Maslach et al 2001, pp. 407-408). “Overcommitment, excessive dedication, lack of awareness of one’s own limitations, lack of separation between one’s life and work, lack of recognition” are also noted as contributing factors (Justice et al. 1981, p. 220). Personality types may also have a predisposing role in burnout; for example “‘feeling’ personality types experience a much greater depletion of emotional energy in the face of negative reactions to people than do thinking types” (Gomez and

Michaelis 1995, p. 23). Jayaratne and Chess (1984) add, “value conflicts” to the list (p. 448). Soderfeldt et al. (1995) outline many of the items above but also add: “low work autonomy, lack of challenge on the job, work in the public sector low salary, empathy, low income, years of experience, low education” (p. 646). Beyond the individual factors, organizational influences have also been posited. “The organizational design that constitutes role structure, power structure, or rule structure has a great effect on job stress and burnout” (Charniss 1980 as cited in Um & Harrison, 1998, p. 16). Continuing with the idea of external influences “societal structure” can influence Social Worker burnout (Arches 1991, p. 202). Interestingly “organizational and management environment” which are also continued within “larger social, cultural, and economic forces” may add to factors of burnout (Maslach et al. 2001, p. 409).

Although most of the research found that burnout is more a social or job situation than an individual issue (Arches, 1991; Courage & Williams, 1997; Farber, 1983; Gomez & Michaelis, 1995; Justice, Gold, & Klein, 1981; Koeske & Koeske, 1989; LeCroy & Rank, 1987; Maslach et al. 2001; Poulin & Walter, 1993; Skovholt, 2001; Soderfeldt, et al., 1995) there are some differences in who is susceptible and what type of burnout is experienced. Certain variables have been found be related to higher burnout: marital status (singles because of less familial support); age (younger because of less stability and experience; gender (women because of more emotional involvement and dedication); education/experience (less education); ethnicity (white and Asian populations); personality type; salary (the less one makes the more one feels it’s not worth getting involved); family (the more family you have the more support you have but also less energy to invest in work); employer type (i.e.

government, because of the structure of some organizations); case/work load (higher); and position rank (lower) are all factors identified in the literature as contributing to burnout in some form (Corcoran, 1987; Courage & Williams, 1987; Farber, 1983; Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1998; Johnson & Stone, 1987; Justice et al., 1981; LeCroy and Rank, 1987; Maslach, 1982; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001).

The results of burnout are not as clear as they may seem. Burnout can affect the individual, the clientele, the organizational, and the entire society. On an individual level burnout can lead to intention to leave, job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, decreased performance, less organizational commitment, depression, suspiciousness, isolation, anger, cynicism, anxiety, impatience, outbursts, exhaustion, insomnia, migraines, denial, blaming, displacing of feelings, deteriorating clinical effectiveness, inefficiency, fatigue, lack of personal accomplishment, depersonalization of clients, recurrent bouts of flu, gastrointestinal problems, headaches, poor self esteem, withdrawal [from socialization], inability to concentrate, tiredness, nightmares, illness, poor eating habits, substance abuse, suicidal ideation, easily irritated, role conflict, and omnipotence (Maslach et al., 2001; see also Cherniss, 1980; Pines & Maslach, 1979 (cited in Arches, 1991, p202); Jayaratne & Chess (1984); Justice et al., 1981; Koeske & Koeske, 1989; Maslach, 1982, Chap 5; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001; Um & Harrison, 1998).

Burnout may also affect the individual's family. Burnout may interfere with functioning at home because the individual is tense and complains about the job at home. This can lead to an increase in family fighting, marital conflict, divorce, less family involvement, isolation, treating family like clients and cynicism towards family (Maslach, 1982).

On the clientele level burnout affects services in the following ways; poor services, deterioration in rapport and trust. Treating others as objects, callous and cruel remarks made towards others, physical force may be overused, and less time spent with clients, less eye contact, longer breaks (Jayaratne & Chess, 1984; Maslach, 1982; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001).

Burnout also inevitably affects the organization. Burnout costs organizations because of employee-separation costs, new worker training costs and time, negative effectiveness and employee productivity as a whole, and higher levels of turnover (Jayaratne & Chess, 1984; Maslach, 1982; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001).

There is mixed opinion as to whether burnout is preventable or even identifiable before the point of many of the results above. Some of the research literature suggests prevention of burnout instead of treatment, in other words proactive work is being talked about instead of reactive. Handling burnout proactively from an individual, social, and organizational perspective before it becomes uncontrollable is the key to eliminating burnout (Maslach, 1982). In identifying how to handle burnout on an individual basis the following are important aspects to keep in mind; work smarter not harder, set realistic goals, do the same thing differently, break away (i.e. short breaks built into work), take things less personally, care for yourself while caring for others, accentuate the positive, know thyself, rest and relaxation, making the transition (i.e. between work and non-work), have a life of your own, last resort, change jobs (Maslach, 1982). On a social and organizational support level the solicitation of colleague's help, comfort, insight, comparison, humor, escape, get-togethers, and group rituals may be great suggestions to invest into (Maslach, 1982). The organization should improve resources, divide up

work, change up contacts with clients, limit job spill over, give time off, and allow for and provide help when needed. (Maslach, 1982).

Since prevention seems to be the focus of most of the researchers it would be prudent to identify some suggested tools. It's never too early (i.e. use solutions before there is a problem); forewarned is forearmed; and the prepared heart and mind needs to learn interpersonal skills, use clients as educators, learn how to start, stop, and keep things going, learn how to deal with different people, & learn how to talk about unpopular topics. (Maslach, 1982; see also Arches, 1991; Gomez & Michaelis, 1995; Soderfeldt and Soderfeldt, 1995; Jayarante & Chess, 1984; Justice et al., 1981; Mor Barak, Nissly, & Levin, 2001; Um & Harrison, 1998).

This literature review has examined the definition of burnout, how burnout has been measured in other studies, and the effects of burnout. Also included are some differences of thought between prevention and alleviation of burnout. Although it is a serious issue, little information was found about the prevalence and issues of burnout in rural areas. The following study covers the prevalence, professional and organizational factors that may prevent or alleviate burnout among Social Workers in one rural state, Maine.

Chapter 3: Methods

This exploratory study used a survey design self-administered questionnaire packet. The questionnaire packet was used to identify levels of burnout among Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers. Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers included: Licensed Master Social Worker (LMSW), Licensed Master Social Worker Clinical Conditional (LMSW-cc), Licensed Clinical Social Worker (LCSW), and Licensed Clinical Social Worker Independent Practice (LCSW-IP). In addition to levels of burnout, risk and resiliency factors were examined. Following is a description of the methods used during this study including the four research questions, population, data collection, measurement techniques, and data analysis.

Research Questions

Based on the literature and the interests of this researcher, the following questions guide this research. First, it is important to determine if burnout is a problem, so prevalence will be examined to find out if burnout is an issue among Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers. Next, by taking a proactive stance it is essential to find out what professionals and organizations are doing to prevent and alleviate burnout. Finally, it is necessary to know the risk and ameliorative factors so that one can know what to prevent alleviate. The following questions were posed to guide the process of this research.

1. What is the prevalence of burnout among Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers?
2. What are professionals doing to help prevent and alleviate the issue?
3. What are professional's perceptions as to what organizations and schools are doing to prevent and alleviate the issue?
4. What are the risk and ameliorative factors associated with burnout in Maine?

Population and Sampling

To survey all Social Workers in the state of Maine would have been impractical. In reaction to this impracticality this research concentrated efforts on Maine Licensed Social Workers at the Masters level. The sampling frame was a list provided by the Maine Licensure Board of all Licensed Masters of Social Work (LMSW), Licensed Masters of Social Work Clinical Conditional (LMSW-cc), Licensed Clinical Social Workers (LCSW), and Licensed Clinical Social Worker Independent Practice (LCSW-IP) (N=2441). A random sample of six hundred current licensees was taken from the list. The random sample was selected using a computer generated random numbers. The list of licensed Social Workers referred to above was sorted in alphabetical order and each person numbered from 1 to 2441. In order to obtain a response adequate for the number of variables that could be included in each regression analysis (10 variables with 20 cases per variable), a sample size of at least 200 was needed. Therefore, to obtain this sample size, and anticipating a response rate of 33%, it was determined that a sample size of 600 was needed. Therefore, 600 numbers were generated by the random number program and the Social Workers with the corresponding numbers were selected to receive questionnaire packets. This afforded the opportunity to provide for approximately twenty five percent of the licensed Masters level Social Workers (n=2441) in the state of Maine to participate.

Data collection

A self-administered questionnaire packet was mailed to the above-described sample (Appendix A). Along with this questionnaire, a return stamped envelope was

included for the respondent's convenience. To keep the cost of the study to a minimal, bulk rate mailing was used for out going questionnaires and business-reply was used for the return of questionnaires.

Included in this packet was a cover letter introducing the study, its purpose, and confidentiality issues. The University of Southern Maine's Institutional Review Board for research done by a student approved this letter and procedures. Including a return stamped envelope and asking respondents not to place identifying information in the packet achieved the required anonymity. There were four instruments included in this questionnaire packet. Instruments one and two measured the respondent's current level of burnout, instrument three gave indication of what the respondent does to alleviate and prevent burnout and their perception of organizational alleviation and prevention, and instrument four was a demographic instrument. Once returned, each questionnaire received a numerical ID to keep all four instruments together.

Instruments

Instrument 1: Am I Burning Out?

There were 25 statements on this instrument (Appendix A). With each statement, respondents were asked to rank, on a scale from one to five, how often the statement is true for them at or away from work. The direction of the scale was, one indicating Rarely True increasing to five indicating Usually True. The scores were added up to determine a total level of burnout on the following scale; 25-50 You're doing well, 51-75 You're okay if you take preventive action, 76-100 You're a candidate for burnout, and 101-125 You're burning out. According to the author has only been used as a teaching tool, and therefore it has not been normed so no reliability or validity data is available (B. Potter, personal communication, August 19,

2003). Nonetheless, the instrument appears to have face validity in the sense that the questions on this instrument are consistent with the literature explaining the signs of burnout.

Instrument 2: Burnout Potential Inventory

There were 48 statements on this instrument (Appendix A). The statements were grouped together into 12 subscales to better identify problems areas. The subscales include; Powerlessness, No Information, Conflict, Poor Team Work, Overload, Boredom, Poor Feedback, Punishment, Alienation, Ambiguity, Unrewarding, and Values Conflict. With each statement, respondents were asked to rank, on a scale from one to nine, how often each situation bothers them at work. The direction of the scale was; one indicating Rarely increasing to nine indicating Constantly. The scores were added up to determine a total level of burnout on the following scale: 48-168 Low, Take Preventative Action; 169-312 Moderate, Develop a plan to correct problem areas; 313-432 High, Corrective action is vital. According to the author has only been used as a teaching tool, and therefore it has not been normed so no reliability or validity data is available (B. Potter, personal communication, August 19, 2003). Nonetheless, the instrument appears to have face validity in the sense that the questions on this instrument are consistent with the literature explaining areas of potential for burnout.

Instrument 3: Prevention and Alleviation of Burnout

This instrument included two sections. The first section asked respondents to check any of sixteen items they thought they were doing to prevent/alleviate burnout individually. Included in section one were areas to include qualitative response. This section specifically attempts to address the question of what professional are doing to

prevent or alleviate burnout. Section two asked respondents to check any of thirteen items they perceived organizations were doing to prevent/alleviate burnout. Also included in section two were areas to include qualitative response. This section specifically attempts to address the question of professional's perceptions of what organizations are doing to prevent or alleviate burnout. Section two asked respondents to check any of thirteen items they perceived organizations were doing to prevent/alleviate burnout. This instrument was created for this questionnaire, from data supported by the literature review, so no previous reliability or validity information was possible. This instrument was dichotomously coded, yielding 1 for checked responses and 2 for no response.

Instrument 4: Demographics

The demographics page included 11 different items. Initially it started with professional questions that included length of time as a licensed masters level Social Worker, present Social Work practice, length of time in present Social Work practice, and previous Social Work practices. The two practice sections included checklists where the respondents could check any practice areas that apply. The instrument then turned to personal questions that included age, gender checklist, ethnicity checklist, relationship status checklist, number of dependents, salary interval checklist, and hours in workweek interval checklist. This instrument was created for this study using common demographic variables.

Data Analysis

All data analyses were performed using SPSS (version 11.5 for Windows). Descriptive statistics were performed on all demographic variables. Frequencies, measures of dispersion (range), and measures of central tendency (mean, median and

mode) were performed on all individual questions in all four instruments, as appropriate to the level of variable, both for the purpose of checking for data errors and to answer research questions about prevalence of burnout (research question one) (instruments one and two) and strategies used by individuals (research question two) (instrument three) and organizations to prevent burnout (research question two) (instrument three).

To answer research question four, correlations were conducted between the total score on Instrument 1, Instrument 2, Instrument 2 subscales and Instrument 3. Because the variables in Instrument 3 were coded dichotomously, correlation analysis was appropriate. (Andrews, Klem, Davidson, O'Malley, & Rodgers, 1981). Correlation analysis was also examined between total scores of Instrument 1, Instrument 2, Instrument 2 subscales and hours in workweek, yearly salary, dependents, age, length of time as a licensed masters level Social Worker, and length of time in current concentration. Based on the statistically significant findings from the correlation analysis, multiple regression models were created to examine the impact of the independent variables (certain risk and alleviation items) on the dependent variables (Instrument 1, Instrument 2, Instrument 2 subscales) (research question four). Cross tabulation was examined to determine the differences (if any) between males and females in reference to burnout levels (research question four).

Chapter 4: Findings

Response Rate

Out of the 600 questionnaire packets sent out, 6 were returned undeliverable and 232 were returned with responses (39% response rate). Because of insufficient data on some of the instruments, an additional 24 packets were discarded, leaving 208 usable packets (35% response rate). This was a loss of 4%. There are many reasons that that 4% were cut from the final responses. Six respondents did not answer any or enough of the questions on the “Am I Burning Out”, instrument one. Eighteen respondents did not answer any or enough of the questions on the “Burnout Potential Inventory”, instrument two. Also among those some respondents did not answer any of the questions on any of the parts of the questionnaire, resulting in a blank questionnaire, a complaint about the questionnaire, or respondents that no longer work in the field. The following demographics are of the remaining 208 responses.

Demographics

There were eleven demographic items. The length of time respondents worked as a licensed masters level social worker ranged from .5 years to 35 years with a mean of 10.94 years and median of 10 years. The majority of respondents indicated that their present social work practice was in mental health (n=150, 72%). Forty-one percent (n=85) indicated that their present field as including incest and sexual abuse, 32.2% (n=67) child welfare, 31.7% (n=66) domestic violence, and 30.3% (n=63) addictions (Appendix B, Table 1.1). Respondent’s length of time in current concentration ranged from .42 years to 33 years, with a mean time of 9.12 years and a median of 7.25 years. The most common response on previous practice was mental

health (n=98, 47.1%). Child welfare, addictions, and domestic violence also had high responses (Appendix B, Table 1.2).

The age of the respondents ranged from 23 years old to 70 years old with a mean of 46.77 years old and a median of 49 years old. The majority of the respondents were female (n=173, 83.2) (Appendix B, Table 1.3), Caucasian/white (193, 92.8%) (Appendix B, Table 1.4), and either married (n=124, 59.6%) or have a committed partner living with them (n=29, 13.9%) (Appendix B, Table 1.5).

Fifty-seven percent (n=119) of the respondents reported having no dependents. Those with dependents reported having 1-6 with a mean of 1; most frequently those dependents were children.

The majority of the respondents (n=105, 50.5%) earns between \$30,001 and \$45,000, with a range from \$0 to more than \$80,000, a mean and median of \$45,001-\$50,000 (Appendix B, Table 1.6) The majority (n=109, 52.4%) work 36-45 hours, with a range from 0 to 75 hours, a mean and median of 36 to 40 hours (Appendix B, Table 1.7).

Prevalence of Burnout among Maine Licensed Master Level Social Workers

Instrument 1 (Am I Burning Out?) contained 25 items. The cumulative score on this instrument ranged from 25 to 98 with a mean of 43.1 and median of 39.5. The majority of Social Workers (n=156, 75%) scored in the low category of “You’re doing well.” None of the Social Workers scored in the top category of “You’re burning out” (Appendix B, Table 2.1). Responses included all levels of answers and some respondents also included commentary that stated if there was a zero for never and a six for always true that would have been their answer

Instrument 2 (Burnout Potential Inventory) contained a total of 48 items with 12 subscales. The overall cumulative score on this instrument ranged from 48 to 305 with a mean of 107.53 and median of 90.81 (Appendix B, Table 2.2). The higher scores on the subscales include powerlessness with a mean of 15, a median of 12; conflict with a mean of 10.2 a median of 8; ambiguity with a mean of 9.7 a median of 7.5; and poor feedback with a mean of 9.2 a median of 7 (Appendix B, Table 2.3). Only a few questions did not run the entire spectrum of answers from respondents. Five questions did not have any answers of constantly: 1. I can't solve the problems assigned to me, 8. I don't understand the purpose of my work, 13. Co-workers undermine me, 21. I have too little to do, and 32. I get blamed for others' mistakes.

Prevention and Alleviation of Burnout

Instrument 3a (Prevention and Alleviation of Burnout) contained 16 items respondents could check to indicate which items they performed to prevent and alleviate burnout individually. Among the items scoring high were: colleague support (n=175, 84.1%), accentuating the positive (n=162, 77.9%), scheduled vacations (n=160, 76.9%), hobbies (n=155, 74.5%), family support (n=154, 74%), and non-work related friend support (n=149, 71.6%) (Appendix B, Table 2.4).

Instrument 3b (Organizational Prevention and Alleviation) contained 13 items that asked respondents to check what they perceived organizations were doing to prevent and alleviate burnout. The majority of respondents checked scheduled supervision (n=146, 70.2%), giving needed time off (n=123, 59.1%), and employee acknowledgement (n=106, 51%) (Appendix B, Table 2.5).

Risk and Ameliorative Factors Associated with Burnout

Instrument 1 (Am I Burning Out?)

Using Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was conducted between Instrument 1 and interval or ratio demographic variables. There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Instrument 1 total score and length of time as a Licensed Master Social Worker ($p=.003$, $r=-.205$), length of time in their current concentration ($p=.005$, $r=-.205$), and age ($p=.001$, $r=-.248$). There was no statistically significant relationship between Instrument 1 and gender ($p=.722$, $\chi^2=.651$).

Using Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was conducted between Instrument 1 and Prevention & Alleviation activities. There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Instrument 1 total score and some individual strategies to prevent and alleviate burn-out, including Colleague Support ($p=.015$, $r=.168$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.250$), Friend Support non-work related ($p=.013$, $r=.172$), Hobby(s) ($p=.001$, $r=.239$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.005$, $r=.193$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.001$, $r=.231$), Sports ($p=.008$, $r=.184$), Self-Motivation ($p=.007$, $r=.188$), Self Rewarding ($p=.005$, $r=.195$), Taking Things Less Personally ($p=.034$, $r=.147$). There were also slight to moderate statistically significant relationships between Instrument 1 total score and two organizational strategies to prevent and alleviate burnout, including Limiting Job Spillover ($p=.034$, $r=.147$) and Empowering Employees ($p=.021$, $r=.160$).

Regression Analysis. A regression model was created with Instrument 1 as the dependent variable and the 10 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support non-work related, Hobby(s), Interactive Social Activities, Setting Realistic Goals,

Sports, Self-Motivation, and Self Rewarding, Taking Things Less Personally. Using a stepwise regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations, Hobby(s), Setting realistic goals($r=.361$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with Instrument 1 as the dependent variable and the 2 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Empowering Employees and Limiting Job Spill Over. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Empowering Employees ($r=.160$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

Instrument 2 (Burnout Potential Inventory)

Using Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was conducted between Instrument 2 and interval or ratio level demographic variables. There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Instrument 2 total score and length of time as a Licensed Master Social Worker ($p=.013$, $r=-.173$), length of time in their current concentration ($p=.008$, $r=-.192$), average hours in work week ($p=.002$, $r=.214$), and age ($p=.001$, $r=-.241$). There was no statistically significant relationship between instrument 1 and gender ($p=.120$, $\chi^2 = 2.421$).

Using Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was conducted between Instrument 2 and Prevention & Alleviation activities. There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Instrument 2 total score and some individual strategies to prevent and alleviate burn-out, including Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.239$), Colleague Support ($p=.002$, $r=.212$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.385$), Friend Support non-work related ($p=.007$, $r=.188$), Hobby(s) ($p=.004$, $r=.198$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.007$, $r=.185$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.001$, $r=.267$), Sports ($p=.020$, $r=.161$), Self-Motivation ($p=.033$, $r=.148$),

and Self Rewarding ($p=.002$, $r=.212$). There were also slight to low statistically significant relationships between Instrument 2 total score and some organizational strategies to prevent and alleviate burnout, including Retreats ($p=.012$, $r=.173$), Limiting Job Spillover ($p=.036$, $r=.146$), Empowering Employees ($p=.003$, $r=.207$), Active Feedback ($p=.019$, $r=.163$), and Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.001$, $r=.253$).

Regression Analysis. A regression model was created with Instrument 2 as the dependent variable and the 10 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support non-work related, Hobby(s), Interactive Social Activities, Setting Realistic Goals, Sports, Self-Motivation, and Self-Rewarding. Using a stepwise regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations, Setting realistic goals, Colleague Support ($r= .451$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with Instrument 1 as the dependent variable and the 4 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Retreats, Limiting Job Spill Over, Employee Acknowledgement, Active Feedback, and Empowering Employees. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement ($r=.253$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

Subscales of Instrument 2

Using Pearson's product-moment correlation analysis was conducted between Instrument 2, interval or ratio level demographic variables, and risk or alleviation activities. There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between

Powerlessness and: Yearly Salary ($p=.020$, $r=-.165$), Age ($p=.005$, $r=-.198$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.005$, $r=-.197$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.007$, $r=-.196$), Colleague Support ($p=.015$, $r=.168$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.250$), Friend Support, not work related ($p=.013$, $r=.172$), Hobby(s) ($p=.040$, $r=.142$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.043$, $r=.141$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.001$, $r=.252$), Self Rewarding ($p=.006$, $r=.191$), Empowering Employees ($p=.019$, $r=.163$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.037$, $r=.145$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between No Information and: Yearly Salary ($p=.042$, $r=-.144$), Age ($p=.004$, $r=-.205$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.026$, $r=-.155$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.010$, $r=-.187$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.315$), Colleague Support ($p=.005$, $r=.194$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.354$), Friend Support, not work related ($p=.004$, $r=.201$), Hobby(s) ($p=.001$, $r=.230$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.012$, $r=.174$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.007$, $r=.186$), Sports ($p=.006$, $r=.190$), Self Rewarding ($p=.013$, $r=.173$), Equal Division of Caseloads ($p=.044$, $r=.140$), Empowering Employees ($p=.018$, $r=.164$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.021$, $r=.161$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Conflict and: Average Hours in Work Week ($p=.003$, $r=.207$), Age ($p=.001$, $r=-.226$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.023$, $r=-.159$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.010$, $r=-.187$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.225$), Colleague Support ($p=.002$, $r=.211$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.220$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.012$, $r=.174$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.003$,

$r=.207$), Self Rewarding ($p=.049$, $r=.137$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.030$, $r=.150$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Poor Team Work and: Hours in Work Week ($p=.012$, $r=.174$), Number of Dependents ($p=.021$, $r=-.160$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.222$), Colleague Support ($p=.004$, $r=.200$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.352$), Friend Support, not work related ($p=.023$, $r=.154$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.021$, $r=.159$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.004$, $r=.199$), Sports ($p=.003$, $r=.205$), Taking Things Less Personally ($p=.013$, $r=.171$), Equal Division of Caseloads ($p=.022$, $r=.159$), Empowering Employees ($p=.006$, $r=.191$), Active Feedback ($p=.019$, $r=.162$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.001$, $r=.255$).

There were slight to moderate statistically significant relationships between Overload and: Hours in Work Week ($p=.001$, $r=.420$), Age ($p=.030$, $r=-.153$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.003$, $r=.202$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.011$, $r=.176$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.011$, $r=.176$), Short Breaks Built Into Work ($p=.001$, $r=.288$), Self-Motivation ($p=.018$, $r=.163$), Limiting Job Spill Over ($p=.013$, $r=.172$), Empowering Employees ($p=.045$, $r=.139$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Boredom and: Yearly Salary ($p=.004$, $r=-.203$), Colleague Support ($p=.012$, $r=.174$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.228$), Friend Support, not work related ($p=.035$, $r=.147$), Hobby(s) ($p=.010$, $r=.179$), Interactive Social Activities ($p=.038$, $r=.144$), Retreats ($p=.019$, $r=.1162$), Empowering Employees ($p=.038$, $r=.144$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.022$, $r=.159$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Poor Feedback and: Yearly Salary ($p=.038$, $r=.147$), Age ($p=.002$, $r=-.222$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.008$, $r=-.186$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.001$, $r=-.256$), Colleague Support ($p=.040$, $r=.143$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.297$), Hobby(s) ($p=.041$, $r=.142$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.001$, $r=.277$), Short Breaks Built Into Work ($p=.025$, $r=.156$), Self-rewarding ($p=.001$, $r=.232$), Retreats ($p=.015$, $r=.169$), Active Feedback ($p=.009$, $r=.180$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.002$, $r=.218$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Punishment and: Average Hours In Work Week ($p=.004$, $r=.200$), Age ($p=.006$, $r=-.192$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.018$, $r=.164$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.322$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.006$, $r=.189$), Sports ($p=.008$, $r=.183$), Scheduled Supervision ($p=.047$, $r=.138$), Retreats ($p=.043$, $r=.141$), Limiting Job Spill Over ($p=.025$, $r=.155$), Active Feedback ($p=.019$, $r=.163$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.003$, $r=.203$).

There were slight to moderate statistically significant relationships between Alienation and: Average Hours In Work Week ($p=.028$, $r=.154$), Age ($p=.001$, $r=-.242$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.002$, $r=-.211$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.006$, $r=-.198$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.254$), Colleague Support ($p=.001$, $r=.253$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.405$), Family Support ($p=.034$, $r=.147$), Friend Support not Work Related ($p=.032$, $r=.149$), Hobby(s) ($p=.016$, $r=.166$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.001$, $r=.230$), Sports ($p=.022$, $r=.159$), Self-Motivation ($p=.011$, $r=.176$), Self-Rewarding ($p=.005$, $r=.194$), Scheduled Supervision ($p=.033$, $r=.148$), Retreats ($p=.003$, $r=.203$), Limiting Job

Spill Over ($p=.039$, $r=.143$), Empowering Employees ($p=.010$, $r=.178$), Active Feedback ($p=.006$, $r=.191$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.001$, $r=.263$).

There were slight to moderate statistically significant relationships between Alienation and: Average Hours In Work Week ($p=.028$, $r=.154$), Age ($p=.001$, $r=-.242$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.002$, $r=-.211$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.006$, $r=-.198$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.254$), Colleague Support ($p=.001$, $r=.253$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.405$), Family Support ($p=.034$, $r=.147$), Friend Support not Work Related ($p=.032$, $r=.149$), Hobby(s) ($p=.016$, $r=.166$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.001$, $r=.230$), Sports ($p=.022$, $r=.159$), Self-Motivation ($p=.011$, $r=.176$), Self-Rewarding ($p=.005$, $r=.194$), Scheduled Supervision ($p=.033$, $r=.148$), Retreats ($p=.003$, $r=.203$), Limiting Job Spill Over ($p=.039$, $r=.143$), Empowering Employees ($p=.010$, $r=.178$), Active Feedback ($p=.006$, $r=.191$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.001$, $r=.263$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Ambiguity and: Average Hours In Work Week ($p=.001$, $r=.229$), Number of Dependents ($p=.024$, $r=-.158$), Age ($p=.007$, $r=-.189$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.015$, $r=-.169$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.012$, $r=-.182$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.014$, $r=.169$), Colleague Support ($p=.022$, $r=.159$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.287$), Hobby(s) ($p=.023$, $r=.158$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.001$, $r=.247$), Sports ($p=.027$, $r=.153$), Self-Rewarding ($p=.029$, $r=.152$), Retreats ($p=.011$, $r=.196$), Equal Division of Caseloads ($p=.025$, $r=.155$), Empowering Employees ($p=.042$, $r=.141$), Active Feedback ($p=.040$, $r=.142$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.001$, $r=.245$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Unrewarding and: Yearly Salary ($p=.020$, $r=-.165$), Age ($p=.001$, $r=-.266$), Length of time as a Masters Level Social Worker ($p=.021$, $r=-.162$), Length of time in current concentration ($p=.016$, $r=-.176$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.256$), Colleague Support ($p=.014$, $r=.170$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.335$), Friend Support not Work Related ($p=.007$, $r=.186$), Hobby(s) ($p=.003$, $r=.206$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.009$, $r=.181$), Self-Motivation ($p=.004$, $r=.197$), Self-Rewarding ($p=.001$, $r=.236$), Scheduled Supervision ($p=.026$, $r=.155$), Retreats ($p=.004$, $r=.197$), Empowering Employees ($p=.004$, $r=.198$), Active Feedback ($p=.014$, $r=.171$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.001$, $r=.262$).

There were slight to low statistically significant relationships between Value Conflict and: Age ($p=.040$, $r=-.145$), Accentuating the Positive ($p=.001$, $r=.274$), Scheduled Vacations ($p=.001$, $r=.324$), Friend Support not Work Related ($p=.015$, $r=.169$), Hobby(s) ($p=.003$, $r=.206$), Setting Realistic Goals ($p=.009$, $r=.181$), Self-Rewarding ($p=.003$, $r=.206$), Retreats ($p=.003$, $r=.204$), Equal Division of Caseloads ($p=.016$, $r=.167$), Empowering Employees ($p=.001$, $r=.243$), Active Feedback ($p=.035$, $r=.146$), Employee Acknowledgement ($p=.002$, $r=.217$).

Regression Analysis. A regression model was created with the Subscale of Powerlessness as the dependent variable and the 10 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support non-work related, Hobby(s), Interactive Social Activities, Setting Realistic Goals, Self-Motivation, Self Rewarding, and Taking Things Less Personally. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically

significant Scheduled Vacations, Setting realistic goals ($r=.351$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Powerlessness as the dependent variable and the 2 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Employee Acknowledgement and Empowering Employees. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Empowering Employees ($r=.163$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of No Information as the dependent variable and the 9 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support non-work related, Hobby(s), Interactive Social Activities, Setting Realistic Goals, Sports, and Self Rewarding. Using a stepwise regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations, Accentuating the Positive, and Hobby(s) ($r=.456$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of No Information as the dependent variable and the 3 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Equal Division of Caseloads, Employee Acknowledgement and Empowering Employees. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Empowering Employees ($r=.164$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Conflict as the dependent variable and the 6 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Interactive Social Activities, Setting Realistic Goals, and Self Rewarding.

Using a stepwise regression analysis, four variables were statistically significant Accentuating the Positive, Scheduled Vacations, Setting Realistic Goals and Colleague Support ($r=.344$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Conflict as the dependent variable and the 1 variable of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Employee Acknowledgement. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement ($r=.150$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Poor Team Work as the dependent variable and the 8 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support non-work related, Interactive Social Activities, Setting Realistic Goals, Sports, and Taking Things Less Personally. Using a stepwise regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations, Accentuating the Positive, and Sports ($r=.406$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Poor Team Work as the dependent variable and the 4 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Equal Division of Caseloads, Employee Acknowledgement and Empowering Employees, Active Feedback. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement and Equal Division of Caseloads ($r=.288$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Overload as the dependent variable and the 5 variables of individual strategies that were statistically

significantly correlated: Scheduled Vacations, Interactive Social Activities, Setting Realistic Goals, Short Breaks Built into Work, and Self-Motivation. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant Short Breaks Built into Work and Scheduled Vacations ($r=.328$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Overload as the dependent variable and the 2 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Limiting Job Spill Over and Empowering Employees. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Limiting Job Spill Over ($r=.172$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Boredom as the dependent variable and the 5 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support non-work Related, Hobby(s), and Interactive Social Activities. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations and Hobby(s) ($r=.328$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Boredom as the dependent variable and the 3 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Retreats, Empowering Employees, and Employee Acknowledgement. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Retreats ($r=.162$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Poor Feedback as the dependent variable and the 6 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Hobby(s), Setting Realistic Goals, Short Breaks Built Into Work, and Self-rewarding. Using a stepwise

regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations Setting Realistic Goals, and Self-rewarding ($r=.398$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Poor Feedback as the dependent variable and the 3 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Retreats, Active Feedback, and Employee Acknowledgement. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement ($r=.218$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Punishment as the dependent variable and the 4 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Scheduled Vacations, Setting Realistic Goals, Sports. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations and Sports ($r=.348$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Punishment as the dependent variable and the 5 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Schedule Supervision, Retreats, Limiting Job Spill Over, Active Feedback, and Employee Acknowledgement. Using a stepwise regression analysis, one variable was statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement ($r=.203$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Alienation as the dependent variable and the 10 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Family Support, Friend Support Non-work Related, Hobby(s), Setting

Realistic Goals, Sports, Self Motivation and Self Rewarding. Using a stepwise regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations Colleague Support, and Setting Realistic Goals ($r=.467$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Alienation as the dependent variable and the 6 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Schedule Supervision, Retreats, Limiting Job Spill Over, Empowering Employees, Active Feedback, and Employee Acknowledgement. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement and Retreats ($r=.306$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Ambiguity as the dependent variable and the 7 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Hobby(s), Setting Realistic Goals, Sports, and Self Rewarding. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations and Setting Realistic Goals ($r=.343$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Ambiguity as the dependent variable and the 5 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Retreats, Equal Division of Case Loads, Empowering Employees, Active Feedback, and Employee Acknowledgement. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement and Retreats ($r=.279$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Unrewarding as the dependent variable and the 8 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Colleague Support, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support Non-work Related, Hobby(s), Setting Realistic Goals, Self-Rewarding, and Self-Motivation. Using a stepwise regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations Accentuating the Positive, and Self-Rewarding ($r=.417$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Unrewarding as the dependent variable and the 5 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Scheduled Supervision, Retreats, Empowering Employees, Active Feedback, and Employee Acknowledgement. Using a stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant, Employee Acknowledgement and Retreats ($r=.302$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Value Conflicts as the dependent variable and the 6 variables of individual strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Accentuating the Positive, Scheduled Vacations, Friend Support Non-work Related, Hobby(s), Setting Realistic Goals, and Self-Rewarding. Using a stepwise regression analysis, three variables were statistically significant Scheduled Vacations, Accentuating the Positive, and Hobby(s) ($r=.408$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.1).

A regression model was created with the Subscale of Value Conflicts as the dependent variable and the 6 variables of organizational strategies that were statistically significantly correlated: Retreats, Empowering Employees, Equal Division of Caseloads, Active Feedback, and Employee Acknowledgement. Using a

stepwise regression analysis, two variables were statistically significant, Empowering Employees and Retreats ($r=.298$, $p<.05$) (Appendix B, Table 3.2).

Chapter 5: Discussion

What is the prevalence of burnout among Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers?

The overall prevalence of burnout among Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers was low. The majority (75%) “Are doing well” according to Instrument 1 and 86.5% are experiencing low burnout according to Instrument 2. None of the respondents were categorized as being ‘burnt out.’ Nonetheless, 13.5-21.6% were in moderate burnout categories and need to take some preventative action. Not surprisingly in the subscales the highest levels of burnout was evident in the Overload category with a mean of 15 and a median of 12, with 97 (46.6%) respondents scoring 15 or greater in this subscale. Other high areas include Conflict (mean of 10.2), Poor Feedback (mean of 9.2), and Ambiguity (mean of 9.7). Respondents scored low in the following categories Boredom (mean of 6.90), No Information (mean of 7.14), Punishment (mean of 7.28), and Value Conflicts (mean of 7.66).

What are professionals doing to help prevent and alleviate the issue?

Social workers utilize many strategies to alleviate burnout. The most commonly checked suggested strategies utilized were colleague support (n=175, 84.1%), accentuating the positive (n=162, 77.9%), scheduled vacations (n=160, 76.9%), hobbies (n=155, 74.5%), and family support (n=154, 74%). While all of these techniques have had an impact, scheduled vacations had the most influence on low burnout (Appendix B, Table 3.1). Although most respondents were doing something to prevent and alleviate burnout, there were a few not doing anything at all (Appendix B, Table 4.1). There were also many items written in by respondents as

prevention and alleviation tools; exercise, spiritual activities, meditation, walking, reading, long commutes, spending time with pets, and outdoors activities.

What are professional's perceptions as to what organizations and schools are doing to prevent and alleviate the issue?

The most common techniques that organizations and schools were doing to prevent and alleviate burnout do not necessarily match the items that were identified as statistically the most helpful. The most identified items included, scheduled supervision (n=146, 70%), giving needed time off (n=123, 59.1%), and employee acknowledgement (n=106, 51%). While the items that were identified as statistically most helpful include employee acknowledgement, retreats, and empowering employees. In some cases respondents even expressed the feeling that supervision was a hindrance to the alleviation of burnout. Unlike individual techniques, organizations don't seem to think about burnout as much. There were 17 respondents who didn't believe organizations were doing anything about burnout and another 65 who thought organizations were only doing up to 3 techniques (Appendix B, Table 4.2). Also unlike the individual skills, the positive qualitative responses in this section were very few. The most negative comments expressed the feeling that budgets did not have the money to support any of the techniques.

What are the risk and ameliorative factors associated with burnout in Maine?

As mentioned earlier the most influential individual factors that were related to lower levels of burnout were scheduled vacations. Also having an impact as ameliorative factors were setting realistic goals and accentuating the positive. Organizationally, certain factors have been identified but are not being used adequately to alleviate burnout. Such factors included scheduled supervision, giving

needed time off, and conferences about burnout. Other factors have a positive impact and were not being used enough, such as retreats and empowering employees. The majority of the respondents perceived employee acknowledgement as important and it is being used effectively.

Some interesting significant correlations were discovered while running the analyses. As respondents' age increased their level of burnout decreased as evidenced by correlations with Instrument 1 ($p=.001$, $r=-.248$) and Instrument 2 ($p=.001$, $r=-.241$). The longer respondents have had their masters level licenses the lower their burnout score as evidenced by correlation with Instrument 1 ($p=.003$, $r=-.205$) and Instrument 2 ($p=.013$, $r=-.173$). Also the longer respondents have spent in their current concentration the lower their burnout as evidenced by correlations with Instrument 1 ($p=.005$, $r=-.205$) and Instrument 2 ($p=.008$, $r=-.192$). The most surprising correlation occurred with average hours worked, it seems the more hours worked the lower the burnout level, Instrument 1 ($p=.033$, $r=.149$) and Instrument 2 ($p=.002$, $r=.214$).

All of these correlations would suggest the older the respondent is, the more time the respondent has their license, the longer the respondent spends at their job, and the more hours the respondent works the less 'burned out' they seem to be. Of course there may be an intervening variable that explains some of this, and that is the correlation of salary, with instrument 1 ($p=.042$, $r=-.144$), meaning the more one gets paid the lower the burnout level. Salary is, of course, correlated with average hours worked and age. The case may be made that burnout could be the independent variable and that people who find strategies to reduce burnout are able to stay longer

in the career and particular job. Those who do know these reduction strategies are less likely to leave the profession?

Limitations

The biggest limitation that this study encountered was budgetary constraints. With more time and funds the researcher could have sent out a second (reminder) letter of the need to return the questionnaire. This would have increased the admittedly low response rate. Also with a larger budget there could have been more questionnaires sent out, increasing the power of the study. Also a longitudinal study could have produced some very interesting results and gleaned some great information in the burnout field. Because the questionnaire was sent statewide it may have been intimidating for respondents to call for questions or concerns. The questionnaire was admittedly long (4 pages, 113 questions), which may have frightened away those already 'burned out.' Because instruments one, two, or three had not been previously normed there was an issue of validity and reliability. However each instrument seemed to have face validity due to the similarities to the issues discussed in the popular literature about burnout.

Implications

There is mixed opinion in the literature about burnout prevalence, its effects, and whether it is identifiable and preventable. While burnout does not seem to be an overall problem among Maine Licensed Masters level social workers, this study did reveal some key aspects for initial prevention, identification, and alleviation.

Implications for Social Workers

Reflected in the data analysis and mirrored in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 the surveyed population is doing well overall. This does not mean that all Social Workers in Maine

are doing well, 3.34% in this study are candidates for burnout and 13.5% need to develop a plan to correct problem areas. Also consider, those that did not respond may already be burned out, that could be up to 65% of Maine Licensed Masters level Social Workers. It is vital that Social Workers spread the wealth of knowledge about prevention and alleviation techniques. Due to the age and experience factors discussed earlier, it is essential that the more experienced Social Workers share how they overcame difficult burnout potential times. Because scheduled vacations was the most influential factor to low burnout it is imperative that social workers take the time to use their vacation time if provided or acquire it if it is not already provided. Setting realistic goals was another important factor to remember, which means Social Workers need to know their limitations and strive for their goals on a realistic level. Although it had a small impact, it is important to mention that colleague support is another factor that can make a difference. As mentioned earlier more experienced and older Social Workers show less signs of burnout which may mean that they have learned to rely on others to guide them through tough times. It is now the time for younger less experienced Social Workers to reach out and allow more experienced Social Workers to give support.

Implications for Agencies

As mentioned earlier, 65% of the Social Workers surveyed did not respond, this may mean that agencies may be in jeopardy of losing a considerable amount of Social Workers due to burnout. As evidenced by table 4.1 and 4.2, organizations do far less activities than individuals do to alleviate or prevent burnout. This may actually increase the already heavy workload on the individuals, and as seen in table 2.3, overload showed the highest level of burnout among the subscales. Burnout can

be relieved by limiting job spill over and therefore decreasing the stress of overload. Another factor that seemed to have an impact is employee acknowledgement, it is important for organizations to recognize their employees. This gives employees a sense of accomplishment necessary to keep a positive outlook about their work. As discussed in the literature review, organizations can save money on new worker training, case overload, and improving employee productivity by increasing their preventative methods that seem to work well (i.e. empowering employees, employee acknowledgement, and retreats.) A negative indication is one of supervision, it seemed that the majority of respondents are receiving supervision. However scheduled supervision is not making an impact to improve burnout. It is recommended that organizations look at their supervisors and supervision techniques to improve the quality so as to prevent and alleviate burnout among their employees.

Implications for Consumers

Keeping with the theme that respondents of the questionnaire are doing well, would indicate that consumers are not suffering due to these Social Workers burning out. Taking into account that 65% did not respond to the questionnaire it is difficult to say how consumers are being affected by possible burned out Social Workers. However, as discussed in the literature review, consumers can be educators to professionals. Many consumers have acquired the skills to survive in stressful situations and understand how to work the systems that Social Workers are employed by.

Conclusion

Respondents and non-respondents have made their own conclusions about burnout, some expressed their views on the questionnaires. This researcher found

Professional Burnout to be an important subject to study and found some interesting results.

Burnout rates were lower than expected, prevalence rates in previous studies found ranges from 33% up to “59.9%” among human service workers and Social Workers (Poulin & Walter, 1993). It seems that overall Maine Licensed Master level Social Workers that responded are doing well at keeping burnout to a minimal. Again one unanticipated indicator was the longer the respondent has been a social worker and older they are the less burnout is a factor. Another astonishing issue was the insignificance of scheduled supervision, despite the fact that many were receiving it, few were finding it effective in the prevention of burnout. Thankfully there were some clues to what is working, scheduled vacations, setting realistic goals, accentuating the positive, and employee acknowledgement were among the top effective skills/techniques found.

As this research project progressed, burnout became more of a complicated issue than initially assumed. At the start of this project the researcher believed that burnout was an individual problem that needed to be dealt with exclusively by the individual. Much of the data in this report would indicate that burnout needs attention from the individual, groups of colleagues, and organizations. To improve effectiveness and reduce or eliminate burnout, all three of these parties need to work together. As Tables 2.3, 3.1, and 3.2 (Appendix B) show, teamwork and support are extremely important factors to the burnout issue. We as a profession teach our consumers to rely on others for help and it seems apropos that we do the same. There are many options that we can take to improve the effectiveness of burnout prevention programs. An organization can set up mentorship programs for newly acquired Social

Workers, whereas a Social worker that has more experience at the organization could be a support for newer less experienced person. Accentuating the positive is an important individual factor, but it does not have to be exclusively individual. Accentuating the positive can be teamed with employee acknowledgement (two influential factors) to reduce burnout. From the results of this study, supervision needs to be re-evaluated and adjusted, because apparently it is not working for the majority of the respondents. Lastly, scheduled vacations had an important impact upon burnout results. Scheduled vacations have a dual party responsibility. It is the responsibility of the organization to ensure that Social workers receive scheduled vacation time. And it is the individual Social Worker's responsibility to take the allotted vacation time.

It is recommended that individuals, organizations and schools that have burnout issues, concerns or education techniques take a look at what is and is not working for Maine licensed Masters level Social Workers and revamp their programs if necessary so that Maine can stay ahead of the curve when it relates to burnout.

A great deal has been written on burnout over the past twenty-five years. The reason for this is that burnout can become a very serious issue. If there is any individual, organization, or school who wishes to become more familiar with burnout risks and ameliorative factors please refer to the reference list. Researchers may want to pay particular attention to books written by Christina Maslach and Dr. Beverly Potter, for they have influenced much of the research seen here.

Appendix A

School of Social Work
 3rd Floor Masterton Hall, 96 Falmouth St.
 P.O. Box 9300
 Portland, ME 04104-9300

UNIVERSITY OF
 Southern Maine

Dear Colleague,

I would like to invite you to participate in my study of Social Worker burnout. I am a Social Work Graduate Student at the University of Southern Maine. Social Worker burnout is an understudied area of research, especially in the state of Maine. I am interested in learning the risk factors, prevalence, and prevention methods of Social Worker burnout in the state of Maine. Universities, organizations, government programs, and even individuals may use the results of this study to help improve awareness of risk factors and prevalence as well as creating better prevention methods for current and future Social Workers. This will enable our field of study and career to grow healthily, to improve services to our clients, and just as important to keep individual Social Workers healthy and happy.

You have been randomly selected from a list of Maine Graduate Level Licensed Social Workers. Only a limited number of surveys have been mailed, so your experiences, thoughts, and responses are extremely important.

The enclosed survey includes four sections:

1. Am I burning out?
2. Burnout Potential Inventory.
3. Prevention and Alleviation questionnaire.
4. Non-Identifying Demographic Data sheet.

Please take the time to complete the survey and return it in the self addressed stamped envelope. It would be helpful to have your completed survey by May 30, 2003.

Your responses are completely **anonymous**. In fact I ask that you do not place your name or any other personal identifiable information on the survey. This survey is completely **voluntary** and you may choose to answer only those questions with which you feel comfortable. If you have any questions or need help completing the survey, please feel free to call or write me at the contact information below.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and timely return of this survey.

Jesse H. Babcock III

Phone (207) 240-1209
 Fax (207) 780-4902

gumlico@yahoo.com

University of Southern Maine
 Graduate School of Social Work
 3rd Floor Masterton Hall
 96 Falmouth St.
 P.O. Box 9300
 Portland, ME 04104-9300

Consent for anonymous survey:

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about risk factors, prevalence, and prevention methods of Social Worker burnout in the state of Maine. Completion of this survey is voluntary and is completely confidential -even research staff will not be able to identify individuals of returned surveys. We ask that you do not put your name or any other identifying information on this survey. Reports will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a participant. If you have any questions about this research project, you may contact:

Jesse H. Babcock III

Phone (207) 240-1209

Fax (207) 780-4902

gumlico@yahoo.com

University of Southern Maine
Graduate School of Social Work
3rd Floor Masterton Hall
96 Falmouth St.
P.O. Box 9300
Portland, ME 04104-9300

Prof. Lacey Sloan, Ph.D.

322 Masterton Hall

Phone (207) 780-4123

Fax (207) 780-4902

lsloan@usm.maine.edu

Prof. Vincent Faherty, DSW, MSW, MBA

307 Masterton Hall

Phone (207) 780-4227

Fax (207) 780-4902

faherty@usm.maine.edu

AM I BURNING OUT?

Instructions:

Read each of the following items, rate how often the statement is true
for you at work or away from work.

(Rarely true) 1 -- 2 -- 3 -- 4 -- 5 (Usually true)

-
- 1. I feel tired even when I've gotten adequate sleep.
 - 2. I am dissatisfied with my work.
 - 3. I feel sad for no apparent reason.
 - 4. I am forgetful.
 - 5. I am irritable and snap at people.
 - 6. I avoid people at work and in my private life.
 - 7. I have trouble sleeping due to worrying about work.
 - 8. I get sick more than I used to.
 - 9. My attitude about work is "why bother?"
 - 10. I often get into conflicts.
 - 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 on my work like I once could.
 - 15. I am easily bored with my work.
 - 16. I work hard but accomplish little.
 - 17. I feel frustrated with my work.
 - 18. I don't like going to work.
 - 19. Social activities are draining.
 - 20. Sex is not worth the effort.
 - 21. I watch TV most of the time when not working.
 - 22. I don't have much to look forward to in my work.
 - 23. I worry about work during my off hours.
 - 24. Feelings about work interfere with my personal life.
 - 25. My work seems pointless.
-

Copyright 1980, 1993, 1998: Beverly a. Potter. From *Overcoming Job Burnout: To Renew Enthusiasm for Work*, Ronin Publishing, Berkeley, CA. Reprinted by permission of Dr. Beverly Potter, Berkeley, CA. www.docpotter.com. All rights reserved. This quiz may be reproduced for personal use only, any other use requires permission. Permission granted for this project 2/21/03

Continue on next page

Burnout Potential Inventory

How often do these situations bother you at work?

Use the scale below to rate how often you are bothered by each situation described in the survey.

(Rarely) 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 9 (Constantly)

Powerlessness

- 1. I can't solve the problems assigned to me.
- 2. I am trapped in my job with no options.
- 3. I am unable to influence decisions that affect me.
- 4. I may be laid off and there is nothing I can do.

No Information

- 5. I am unclear about the responsibilities of my job.
- 6. I don't have information I need to perform well.
- 7. People I work with don't understand my role.
- 8. I don't understand the purpose of my work.

Conflict

- 9. I am caught in the middle.
- 10. I must satisfy conflicting demands.
- 11. I disagree with people at work.
- 12. I must violate procedures to get my job done.

Poor Team Work

- 13. Co-workers undermine me.
- 14. Management displays favoritism.
- 15. Office politics interfere with my doing my job.
- 16. People compete instead of cooperate.

Overload

- 17. My job interferes with my personal life.
- 18. I have too much to do in too little time.
- 19. I must work on my own time.
- 20. My workload is overwhelming.

Boredom

- 21. I have too little to do.
- 22. I am overqualified for the work I actually do.
- 23. My work is not challenging.
- 24. The majority of my time is spent on routine tasks.

Poor Feedback

- 25. I don't know what I'm doing right or wrong.
- 26. My supervisor doesn't give feedback on my work.
- 27. I get information too late to act on it.
- 28. I don't see the results of my work.

Punishment

- 29. My supervisor is critical.
- 30. Someone else gets credit for my work.
- 31. My work is unappreciated.
- 32. I get blamed for others' mistakes.

Alienation

- 33. I am isolated from others.
- 34. I am just a cog in the organizational wheel.
- 35. I have little in common with people I work with.
- 36. I avoid telling people where I work or what I do.

Ambiguity

- 37. The rules are constantly changing.
- 38. I don't know what is expected of me.
- 39. There is no relationship between performance and success.
- 40. Priorities I must meet are unclear.

Unrewarding

- 41. My work is not satisfying.
- 42. I have few real successes.
- 43. My career progress is not what I'd hoped.
- 44. I don't get respect.

Values Conflict

- 45. I must compromise my values.
- 46. People disapprove of what I do.
- 47. I don't believe in the company.
- 48. My heart is not in my work.

Prevention and Alleviation of Burnout

What are you doing to prevent and alleviate yourself from burning out?

Please check all that apply and feel free to elaborate.

- Accentuating the positive _____
 - Colleague support _____
 - Counseling or therapy _____
 - Scheduled Vacations _____
 - Family support _____
 - Friend support (not work related) _____
 - Hobby(s) _____
 - Interactive social activities _____
 - Setting realistic goals _____
 - Sports _____
 - Short breaks built into work _____
 - Self-Motivation _____
 - Self-Rewarding _____
 - Taking things less personally _____
 - Transition time between work and home _____
 - Other (please explain) _____
-
-

What do you perceive organizations and schools are doing to prevent and alleviate burnout?

This applies to schools, organizations, and employers that you have been a part of as well as the ones you have observed.

Please check all that apply and feel free to elaborate.

- Conferences about burnout/compassion fatigue _____
 - Individual training _____
 - Scheduled supervision _____
 - Retreats _____
 - Dedicated classes about burnout _____
 - Equal division of caseloads _____
 - Limiting job spill over _____
 - Give needed time off _____
 - Empowering Employees _____
 - Goal directing _____
 - Active Feedback _____
 - Employee acknowledgement _____
 - Other (please explain) _____
-
-

Continue on next page

Demographics

1. Length of time as a Licensed Masters Level Social Worker:

_____ _____
Years Months

2. Present Social Work Practice (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Addictions | <input type="checkbox"/> End of Life | <input type="checkbox"/> Poverty/Social Justice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administration | <input type="checkbox"/> Incest and Sexual Abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Practice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aging | <input type="checkbox"/> Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol, Tobacco & Other Drugs | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness | <input type="checkbox"/> School Social Work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Immigrants/Refugees | <input type="checkbox"/> Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare | <input type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Violence | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <i>(Please specify)</i> |

3. Length of time in this concentration:

_____ _____
Years Months

4. Previous Social Work Practice (if any, if not please skip):

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Addictions | <input type="checkbox"/> End of Life | <input type="checkbox"/> Poverty/Social Justice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administration | <input type="checkbox"/> Incest and Sexual Abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> Private Practice |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aging | <input type="checkbox"/> Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Alcohol, Tobacco & Other Drugs | <input type="checkbox"/> Homelessness | <input type="checkbox"/> School Social Work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health | <input type="checkbox"/> Immigrants/Refugees | <input type="checkbox"/> Veterans |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Child Welfare | <input type="checkbox"/> Multiculturalism | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Violence | <input type="checkbox"/> Policy | <i>(Please specify)</i> |

5. Age: _____
(at last birthday)

6. Gender:

- Female
 Male
 Transgender

7. Ethnicity:

- African American
 Asian American
 Caucasian/White
 Hispanic/Latino
 Indian
 Native American
 Pacific Islander
 Other _____
(please specify)

8. Marital/
relationship status:

- Single never
 married
 Married
 Divorced
 Separated
 Widowed
 Committed partner
 not living with
 Committed Partner
 living with

9. Number of
dependents and type

10. Yearly Salary:

- \$1-\$5,000
 \$5,000-\$10,000
 \$10,001-\$15,000
 \$15,001-\$20,000
 \$20,001-\$25,000
 \$25,001-\$30,000
 \$30,001-\$35,000
 \$35,001-\$40,000
 \$40,001-\$45,000
 \$45,001-\$50,000
 \$50,001-\$55,000
 \$55,001-\$60,000
 \$60,001-\$65,000
 \$65,001-\$70,000
 \$70,001-\$75,000
 \$75,001-\$80,000
 More than \$80,000

11. Average hours in
workweek:

- 1-5
 5-10
 11-15
 16-20
 21-25
 26-30
 31-35
 36-40
 41-45
 46-50
 51-55
 56-60
 61-65
 66-70
 71-75
 76-80
 81-85
 86 +

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey, please remember to mail it back.☺

Jesse H. Babcock III, USM School of Social Work, 96 Falmouth St. PO Box 9600 Portland, ME 04104-9300

End of survey

University of Southern Maine

Request for study

Exemption from IRB Review

University of Southern Maine

Notice of Evaluation-

Exemption from IRB Review

Copyright Permission for Instruments

Appendix B

Table 1.1

Present Social Work Practice

Practice Concentration	N	%
Addictions	63	30.3
Administration	58	27.9
Aging	26	12.5
Alcohol, Tobacco, & other Drugs	49	23.6
Mental Health	150	72.1
Child Welfare	67	32.2
Domestic Violence	66	31.7
End of Life	23	11.1
Incest and Sexual Abuse	85	40.9
Health	45	21.6
Homelessness	31	14.9
Immigrants/refugees	10	4.8
Multiculturalism	19	9.1
Policy	17	8.2
Poverty/ Social Justice	29	13.9
Private Practice	48	23.1
Research	7	3.4
School Social Work	33	15.9
Veterans	12	5.8
Other	40	19.2
No Answer	2	1

Note: totals more than 100% because respondents could provide more than one response

Table 1.2**Previous Social Work Practice**

	N	%
Addictions	46	22.1
Administration	26	12.5
Aging	25	12
Alcohol, Tobacco, & other Drugs	34	16.3
Mental Health	98	47.1
Child Welfare	49	23.6
Domestic Violence	36	17.3
End of Life	20	9.6
Incest and Sexual Abuse	46	22.1
Health	31	14.9
Homelessness	26	12.5
Immigrants/refugees	10	4.8
Multiculturalism	12	5.8
Policy	9	4.3
Poverty/ Social Justice	20	9.6
Private Practice	23	11.1
Research	8	3.8
School Social Work	27	13
Veterans	12	5.8
Other	37	17.8

Note: totals more than 100% because respondents could provide more than one response

Table 1.3**Gender**

	N	%
Female	173	83.2
Male	31	14.9
No Answer	4	1.9
Total	208	100

Table 1.4**Ethnicity**

	N	%
Asian American	2	1
Caucasian/ White	193	92.8
Hispanic/ Latino	1	.5
Native American	5	2.4
Other	3	1.4
No Answer	4	1.9
Total	208	100

Table 1.5**Marital status**

	N	%
Single never married	24	11.5
Married	124	59.6
Divorced	19	9.1
Widowed	4	1.9
Committed partner/ not living with	5	2.4
Committed partner/ living with	29	13.9
No Answer	3	1.4
Total	208	100

Table 1.6**Salary**

Yearly Salary	N	%	Cumulative %
\$00	1	.5	.5
\$1-\$5,000	3	1.4	1.9
\$15,001-\$20,000	5	2.4	4.3
\$20,001-\$25,000	6	2.9	7.2
\$25,001-\$30,000	17	8.2	15.4
\$30,001-\$35,000	37	17.8	33.2
\$35,001-\$40,000	33	15.9	49.1
\$40,001-\$45,000	35	16.8	65.9
\$45,001-\$50,000	19	9.1	75
\$50,001-\$55,000	14	6.7	81.7
\$55,001-\$60,000	9	4.3	86
\$60,001-\$65,000	8	3.9	89.9
\$65,001-\$70,000	6	2.9	92.8
\$70,001-\$75,000	5	2.4	95.2
\$75,001-\$80,000	1	.5	95.7
More than \$80,000	1	.5	96.2
No Answer	8	3.8	100
Total	208	100	

Table 1.7
Average Hours in Work Week

Hours	N	%	Cumulative %
00	1	.5	.5
1-5	2	1.0	1.5
5-10	2	1.0	2.5
11-15	1	.5	3
16-20	2	1.0	4
21-25	12	5.7	9.7
26-30	10	4.8	14.5
31-35	22	10.6	25.1
36-40	54	26.0	51.1
41-45	55	26.4	77.5
46-50	29	13.9	91.4
51-55	11	5.3	96.7
56-60	3	1.4	98.1
71-75	1	.5	98.6
No Answer	3	1.4	100
Total	208	100	

Table 2.1**Burnout Totals According to Instrument 1**

Level of Burnout	N	%	Cumulative %
25-50 “You’re doing well”	156	75	75
51-75 “You’re okay if you take preventative action”	45	21.63	96.63
76-100 “You’re a candidate for burnout”	7	3.37	100
101-125 “You’re burning out”	0	0	100
Total	208	100	

Table 2.2**Burnout Totals According to Instrument 2**

Level of Burnout	N	%	Cumulative %
48-168 Low. “Take preventative action”	180	86.5	86.5
169-312 Moderate “Develop a plan to correct problem areas”	28	13.5	100
313-432 High “Corrective action is vital”	0	0	100
Total	208	100	

Table 2.3**Subscale Totals from Instrument 2**

Subscale	Mean	Median	Min-Max
Powerlessness	8.5	7	4-30
No Information	7.1	5	4-27
Conflict	10.2	8	4-30
Poor Team Work	8.5	6	4-32
Overload	15.0	12	4-36
Boredom	6.9	5	4-27
Poor Feed Back	9.2	7	4-36
Punishment	7.2	4	4-31
Alienation	8.2	6	4-30
Ambiguity	9.7	7.5	4-33
Unrewarding	8.7	5.5	4-36
Values Conflict	7.6	5	4-29.95

Table 2.4**Individual Alleviation Techniques Totals**

Technique	N	%
Accentuating the positive	162	77.9
Colleague Support	175	84.1
Counseling/therapy	44	21.2
Scheduled Vacations	160	76.9
Family support	154	74.0
Friend support, non work	149	71.6
Hobbies	155	74.5
Interactive social activities	98	47.1
Setting realistic goals	127	61.1
Sports	88	42.3
Short breaks in work	88	42.3
Self-motivation	106	51.0
Self-rewarding	91	43.8
Taking things less personally	133	63.9
Transition time between work and home	81	38.9
Other	62	29.8

Note: totals more than 100% because respondents could provide more than one response

Table 2.5
Organizational Alleviation Techniques Totals

Item	N	%
Conferences	91	43.8
Individual trainings	53	25.5
Scheduled supervision	146	70.2
Retreats	76	36.5
Dedicated classes	9	4.3
Equal division of caseloads	65	31.3
Limiting job spill over	21	10
Give needed time off	123	59.1
Empowering employees	78	37.5
Goal directing	41	19.7
Active feedback	71	34.1
Employee acknowledgement	106	51.0
Other	20	9.6

Note: totals more than 100% because respondents could provide more than one response

Table 3.1

Regression Analysis between Burnout Instruments and Individual Alleviation Techniques

	Instrument 1	Instrument 2	Powerlessness	No Information	Conflict	Poor Team Work	Overload	Boredom	Poor Feedback	Punishment	Alienation	Ambiguity	Unrewarding	Values Conflict
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Accentuating the Positive		.113		.237*	.132*	.143*				.091	.121	.088	.164*	.202*
Colleague support	.112	.142*	.082	.077	.139*	.095		.133	.076		.183*	.105	.069*	
Scheduled Vacations	.179*	.321*	.250*	.280*	.140*	.300*	.158*	.203*	.234*	.300*	.344*	.244*	.279*	.259*
Family Support											.030			
Friend Support Non-Work Related	.063	.082	.083	.058		.058		.074			.035		.072	.041
Hobby(s)	.190*	.116	.081	.148*				.143*	.059		.080	.099	.123	.132*
Interactive Social Activities	.096	.082	.069	.043	.070	.056	.082	.089						
Setting Realistic Goals	.173*	.185*	.198*	.070	.139*	.111	.167		.190*	.127	.140*	.194*	.104	.078
Sports	.116	.080		.087		.136*				.133*	.067	.110		
Short Breaks Built Into Work							.261*		.049					
Self-Motivation	.103	.064	.002				.108				.099		.056	
Self-Rewarding	.109	.120	.118	.064	.049				.157*		.105	.078	.162*	.113
Taking Things Less Personally	.056		-.048			.086								

* p < .05

Table 3.2

Regression Analysis between Burnout Instruments and Individual Alleviation Techniques

	Instrument 1	Instrument 2	Powerlessness	No Information	Conflict	Poor Team Work	Overload	Boredom	Poor Feedback	Punishment	Alienation	Ambiguity	Unrewarding	Values Conflict
	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β	β
Scheduled Supervision										.072	.000		.012	
Retreats		.131						.162 *	.133	.107	.160 *	.136 *	.154 *	.174 *
Equal Division of Caseloads				.108		.134 *						.120		.104
Limiting Job Spill Over	.109	.085					.172 *			.109	.086			
Empowering Employees	.160 *	.121	.163 *	.164 *		.074	.096	.124			.072	.037	.097	.220 *
Active Feedback		.053				.030			.097	.084	.071	.021	.046	.028
Employee Acknowledgement		.253 *	.093	.111	.150 *	.241 *		.134	.218 *	.203 *	.233 *	.220 *	.233 *	.114

* p < .05

Table 4.1**Total Alleviation/Prevention Skills Applied by
Individuals**

Number of Skills Used	N	%	Cumulative %
.00	3	1.4	1.4
2.00	1	.5	1.9
3.00	3	1.4	3.3
4.00	8	3.8	7.1
5.00	11	5.3	12.4
6.00	18	8.7	21.1
7.00	26	12.5	33.6
8.00	31	14.9	48.5
9.00	15	7.2	7.2
10.00	17	8.2	63.9
11.00	25	12.0	75.9
12.00	19	9.1	85
13.00	12	5.8	90.8
14.00	13	6.3	97.1
15.00	5	2.4	99.5
16.00	1	.5	100
Total	208	100	

Table 4.2**Total Alleviation/Prevention Skills Applied by Organizations**

Number of Skills Used	N	%	Cumulative %
.00	17	8.2	8.2
1.00	21	10	18.2
2.00	17	8.2	26.4
3.00	27	13.0	39.4
4.00	21	10	46.4
5.00	35	16.8	66.2
6.00	27	13.0	79.2
7.00	16	7.7	86.9
8.00	12	5.8	92.7
9.00	9	4.3	97
10.00	2	1.0	98
11.00	2	1.0	99
12.00	1	.5	99.5
22.00	1	.5	100
Total	208	100	

References

- Arches, J. (1991). Social structure, burnout, and job satisfaction. *Social Work*, 36, 202-206.
- Andrews, F.M., Klem, L. Davidson, T.N., O'Malley, P.M., and Rodgers, W.L. (1981). *A Guide for Selecting Statistical Techniques for Analyzing Social Science Data* (2nd Ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan, Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research.
- Carney, J., Donovan, R., Yurdin, M., Starr, r., Pernell-Arnold, A., Bromberg, ELM. (1993). Incidence of burnout among New York City intensive case managers: Summary of findings. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 16(4), 25-39.
- Corcoran, K. J. (1987). The association of burnout in social work practitioners' impression of their clients: Empirical evidence. In D. F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp. 57-66). New York: Haworth Press.
- Courage M.M., & Williams, D.D. (1987). An approach to the study of burnout in professional care providers in human service organizations. In D. F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp 7-22). New York: Haworth Press.
- Farber, B. (1983). Introduction: A critical perspective on burnout. In B. A. Farber (Ed.), *Stress and burnout in the human service professions* (pp. 1-22). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Gillespie, D. F. (1987). Introduction. In D. F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp 3-6). New York: Haworth Press.
- Golembiewski, R.T. & Munzenrider, R.F. (1998). *Phases of Burnout*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

- Gomez, J.S. & Michaelis, R.C. (1995) An assessment of burnout in human service providers. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 61(1), 23-26.
- Grosh, W.N. & Olsen, D.C. (1994). *When helping starts to hurt: A new look at burnout among psychotherapists*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Himle, D. P., Jayaratne, S. D., & Chess, W. A. (1987). Gender differences in work stress among clinical social workers. In D. F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp. 41-56). New York: Haworth Press.
- Johnson, M., & Stone, G. L. (1987). Social workers and burnout: A psychological description. In D. F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp. 67-80). New York: Haworth Press.
- Jayaratne, S., & Chess, W. A. (1984). Job satisfaction, burnout, and turnover: A national study. *Social Work*, 24, 448-453.
- Justice, B., Gold, R. S., & Klein, J.P. (1981). Life events and burnout. *Journal of Psychology*, 108, 219-226.
- Koeske, G.F. & Koeske, R.D. (1989) Workload and burnout: Can social support and Perceived accomplishment help? *Social Work*, 34, 243-248.
- LeCroy, C. W., & Rank, M. R. (1987). Factors associated with burnout in the social services: An exploratory study. . In D.F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp. 23-39). New York: Haworth Press.
- Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout--The cost of caring*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Maslach, C. (1987). Burnout research in the social services: A critique. In D. F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp. 95- 105). New York: Haworth Press.

- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001) Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 297-422.
- Mor Barak, M.E., Nissly, J.A., & Levin, A. (2001) Antecedents to Retention and turnover among child welfare, social work, and other human service employees: What can we learn from past research? A review and metanalysis. *Social Service Review*, 75 (4), 625-661.
- Pines, A. (1993) On burnout and the buffering effects of social support. In B. A. Farber (Ed.), *Stress and burnout in the human service professions* (pp. 155-174). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Potter, B. (1998). *Overcoming job burnout: How to renew enthusiasm for work* (2nd ed. retitled). Oakland, CA: Ronin Publishing.
- Poulin, J.E. & Walter, C.A. (1993). Burnout in gerontological social work. *Social Work*, 38, 305-311.
- Skovholt, T.M. (2001). *The Resilient Practitioner: Burnout prevention and self-care strategies for counselors, therapists, teachers, and health professionals*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Soderfeldt, M., Soderfeldt, B., & Warg, L. (1995) Burnout in social work. *Social Work*, 40, 638-646.
- Stav, A., Florian, V., & Zernitsky Shurka, E. (1987). Burnout among social workers working with physically disabled persons and bereaved families. In D. F. Gillespie (Ed.), *Burnout among social workers* (pp. 81-94). New York: Haworth Press.

Um, M.Y. & Harrison, D.F. (1998). Role stressors, burnout, mediators, and job satisfaction: A Stress-strain-outcome model and an empirical test. *Social Work*, 22, 100-115.