DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 176   SP 041 245

AUTHOR   Evers, Will J. G.; Tomic, Welko
TITLE   Students' Perceptions of the Incidence of Burnout Among Their
                Teachers.
PUB DATE   2002-00-00
NOTE   33p.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE   EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Classroom Techniques; Coping; Discipline; Foreign Countries;
                Postsecondary Education; *Predictor Variables;
                Questionnaires; Secondary Education; Self Efficacy; Student
                Attitudes; *Student Behavior; *Teacher Burnout; *Teacher
                Competencies; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS   Netherlands; *Psychosocial Factors

ABSTRACT
                This study examined students' perceptions of teacher burnout
in relation to the occurrence of disruptive student behavior and teacher
competence to cope with this behavior. It also examined whether three survey
instruments could be adapted to enable students to report on their teachers'
psychosocial wellbeing. Participants were students in their late teens and
early twenties attending a Regional Training Center in the Netherlands.
Students completed three adapted questionnaires: the Dutch version of the
Maslach Burnout Inventory for teachers, the Coping with Destructive Behavior
questionnaire (an adapted version of the Self-Efficacy Scale for Classroom
Management and Discipline), and the Perceived Disruptive Behavior Scale (an
adapted version of the Order and Organization subscale of the Classroom
Environment Scale). Results showed that the three scales could be adapted to
students to report perceived teacher burnout symptoms, the occurrence of
perceived disruptive student behavior, and perceived teacher competence to
cope with disruptive behavior. Students' perceptions did not differ by age.
There was a significant difference between the perceptions of males and
females regarding emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, but not
personal accomplishment. Significant variance in each of the three burnout
dimensions was explained by teacher competence to cope with student
disruptive behavior and perceived disruptive student behavior. (Contains 55
references.) (SM)

Students' Perceptions of the Incidence of Burnout

among Their Teachers

Will J. G. Evers

Welko Tomic

Department of Psychology

The Open University

Heerlen, the Netherlands

Running Head: Students' Perceptions of Teacher Burnout

Keywords: Students' perceptions, Teacher Burnout, Vocational

Education

Correspondence: Welko Tomic

Faculty of Social Sciences,

The Open University

P. O. Box 2960

6401 DL Heerlen

The Netherlands.

Telephone 045-5762539, fax 045-5762939

E-mail address Welko.Tomic@ou.nl

Abstract

The aim of this study was to explore students' perception of teacher burnout in relation to the occurrence of disruptive student classroom behavior and the teachers' competence to cope with this kind of behavior. First, the study shows that the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the Coping with Disruptive Behavior Scale, and the Perceived Disruptive Behavior Scale could be adapted to students to report perceived burnout symptoms among their teachers, the occurrence of perceived disruptive student behavior, and the students' perception of their teachers' competence to cope with disruptive student behavior. Second, students' perceptions do not differ according to their age. Third, we found that there was a significant difference between the perceptions of male and female students in respect of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, but not in respect of personal accomplishment. Finally, a considerable percentage of variance in each of the three burnout dimensions is explained by teachers' competence to cope with student disruptive behavior, and perceived disruptive student behavior.

Students' perceptions of their teachers appear to contribute valid information on the mental health of the latter. It would be advisable for future research on teacher burnout to be based both on the teachers' self reports and on the students' reports.

Introduction

Research reveals that burned out human service professionals, including teachers have had and perhaps are still having a hard time. Although the fit between them and their job has been disrupted (Galloway, Boswell, & Pankhurst, 1981; Smith & Bourke, 1992), they continue their work, and by doing so, harm their own health and the well-being of their clients.

Students need mentally and physically fit grown-ups who can guide them as they find their way in our world. Burned out teachers suffer from irritability (Huberman, 1993), and they are found to be responsible for student apathy (Jenkins & Calhoun, 1991). Teachers are known to continue working in spite of burnout symptoms (Dworkin, 1985; Hock, 1988) or reduced classroom management skills (Blase, 1984; Smith & Bourke, 1992).

As burned out teachers negatively affect themselves, their students, and the educational system (Hughes, 2001), it is necessary to develop and promote the use of instruments to accurately measure teacher burnout. As a complement to teachers' reports on their own health, their students could give valid information about them, thus helping to discover burnout among teachers at an earlier stage and making timely preventive or restorative intervention strategies possible. Teachers play such a valuable role in helping our children grow up that any opportunity to promote their physical and mental health should be seized.

Teacher Burnout

According to the well-known definition of burnout (Maslach, 1976; Maslach & Jackson, 1981), burned out people suffer from emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduced sense of personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally overextended and having depleted one's emotional resources. Depersonalization refers to a negative, callous, and detached attitude towards the people one works with, i.e. patients, clients, or students. Reduced personal accomplishment refers to someone's negative self-evaluation in relation to his job performance (Schaufeli, Maslach, & Marek, 1993).

Many studies on burnout stress a behavioral aspect of the syndrome while many others stress a mental aspect. Oranje (2001) divides studies on burnout into three categories. First, burnout is considered to be a coping problem (the interaction model), i.e. burnout stems from the negative outcome of an individual's judgment of his own abilities in relation to real or imagined stressors in the individual's environment (Byrne, 1991; Cherniss, 1980; Eskridge & Coker, 1985).

Second, some studies view burnout as a state of both physical and mental exhaustion that strikes the individuals involved for a long time in situations that exact a heavy emotional toll (Kremer-Hayon & Kurtz, 1985). This view is categorized as the response or physiological model.

Third, some studies depart from the view that it is the environment that produces stressors responsible for the onset of burnout. Examples of such environmental stressors are the social relationships of the teachers with students, colleagues and principals (Brouwers & Tomic, 1999; Feitler & Tokar, 1980), and the organizational working circumstances (Brenner, Sorbom, & Wallius, 1985; Burke & Richardsen, 1996; Van Dierendonck, Schaufeli, & Buunk 1998).

Although burnout symptoms also occur among blue-collar workers, it is the category of human service workers who appear to run the greatest risk of falling victim to the burnout syndrome (Freudenberger, 1975). Teachers in particular experience many stressful events in their careers (Burke, Greenglass, & Schwarzer, 1996). Although Selye (1976) divided stress into eustress (stress positively influencing behavior) and distress (stress negatively influencing behavior), work stress is usually associated with the negative aspects of someone's professional career.

It is, however, a serious problem that so far, teacher burnout studies have lacked a firm theoretical basis and that proof of causal relationships between environmental stressors and individual health consequences is almost entirely lacking. Guglielmi and Tatrow (1998) posit that burnout research lacks a theoretical framework that unifies and guides empirical research on burnout. To meet one of their most essential objections, we departed from the self-efficacy theory when composing the

questionnaire on teacher competence in order to measure domain specific teacher classroom behavior. In some studies, the self-efficacy theory appeared to be a promising conceptual framework for studying teacher burnout (Brouwers, 2000; Evers, Brouwers & Tomic, 2002).

Guglielmi and Tatrow's (1998) second objection to many burnout studies is related to how valid data is collected about the phenomenon. Generally speaking, self-report questionnaires and self-reported information to medical doctors and/or psychologists form the quintessential proof that someone suffers from burnout to a certain degree. Because of the many negative consequences accompanying burnout, it is a matter of great importance to improve the assessment of its incidence. That is why we adapted self-report questionnaires so as to enable students to score the items.

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is more often than not the only instrument used as a questionnaire to assess self-reported teacher burnout. However, an instrument may be adapted in such a way that it enables the clients to report perceived symptoms of burnout among their human service workers. In the educational domain, Tatar and Yahav (1999) were the first to apply a shortened version of the MBI as an instrument; they had students fill out the items on this instrument to report perceived symptoms of burnout among their teachers.

Before the publication of this study, the complete MBI had never been used to assess clients' perception on burnout among

their human service workers. However, using a specific instrument to reflect the views of both professional and client is not uncommon. For instance, Hendriks, Hofstee, and De Raad (1999) used the Five Factor Personality Inventory as a self-report questionnaire and as a questionnaire to estimate the personality characteristics of others. Furthermore, due to their intensive daily contact with their teachers, students are in a prime position to assess symptoms of teacher burnout.

As student behavior can induce stress, the present study focuses on a relatively unexplored topic, viz. the students' views on teacher burnout related to their own disruptive behavior and the teachers' competence to cope with this kind of behavior.

Tatar and Yahav (1999) used an adapted version of the MBI (14 items), divided into three sections. In their study, they asked secondary school pupils ($\underline{N}$ = 297) to score the items describing potential characteristics of burned out teachers. First of all, their findings show that pupils' perceptions of the occurrence of burnout among their teachers can supply researchers with reliable data. Second, the study stresses the importance of the pupils' views in analyzing burnout among teachers, which will ultimately lead to a better understanding of the role of pupil behavior in the origin of teacher burnout. Third, there are no significant differences between the views of male and female pupils in Tatar and Yahav's study.

Tatar and Yahav (1999) derived their results from a limited number of secondary school pupils with a mean age of 15.8 years

who were attending general education. We went one step further, and asked students aged between 16 and 23 from a random sample of classes (17 out of 69) at a Regional Training Center (N = 411 students) to participate in our study. In order to acquire data on teacher burnout from our respondents, we used three questionnaires. First, we used an adapted version of the MBI; second, a questionnaire on student disruptive behavior (PDBS), and third, a questionnaire on the teachers' competence to cope with disruptive student behavior (CDBS).

We concentrated on disruptive behavior for various studies found significant correlations between disruptive student behavior, the teachers' competence to cope with this behavior and burnout among teachers (Blase, 1982; Brouwers & Tomic, 1999, Byrne, 1991). Moreover, in the case at issue, the relationship between teachers and students fits in with the environmental approach to burnout.

In contrast to the respondents in Tatar and Yahav's study, our students all attended vocational training. We also focused on teachers who work closely (grade teachers, i.e. teachers who are mentor and student adviser of a specific group of students) with their students, so it goes without saying that these "clients" are good judges of their educators. The literature supports our assumption. Pupils and students have sensible views on their classroom environment (Batten, 1988; Hofstein, Gluzman, Ben Zwi, & Samuel, 1980; Levine & Donitsa-Schmidt, 1996; Raviv, Raviv, & Reisel, 1990), on school discipline (Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997;

Scarlett, 1988), and finally on teachers as persons (Tatar, 1998; Jules, & Kutnick, 1997).

Our study on teacher burnout also investigated whether there were age-related and gender-related differences between the students' perceptions of teacher burnout (Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997; Jules & Kutnick, 1997; Tatar, 1998).

In sum, the present study examines various issues. First, it examines whether the MBI, the CDBS, and the PDBS can be turned into reliable instruments enabling our student population to report on the psychosocial well-being of their grade teachers. Second, it examines the perceived degree on the three dimensions of burnout based on the students' scores on the adapted MBI-questionnaire. Third, it examines the degree of disruptive student classroom behavior as perceived by the students themselves. Fourth, in line with this, the study aims to measure the perceived grade teachers' competence to cope with disruptive student classroom behavior. Finally, it aims to answer the question whether the students' age and gender are significantly related to (1) the perceived dimensions of burnout among grade teachers, (2) disruptive student classroom behavior as perceived by the students and (3) the perceived grade teachers' competence to cope with disruptive student classroom behavior.

<center>Method</center>

Participants

We took a random sample consisting of 25% of the classes, i.e. 17 out of 69 (which number indicates that 411 out of 1782

students participated in our study) at a Regional Training Center

(RTC) in the southern part of the Netherlands. Students in their

late teens and early twenties attend vocational training at an

RTC. Our sample was divided into 159 female students (38.7%) and

252 male students (61.3%). Their mean age was 18.3 years (SD =

2.43), ranging from 16 to 23 years of age. As the mean age of all

students (N = 1782) was 18.5 (SD = 2.23), there was no

significant difference between our sample and the total school

population, t(2.191) = 1.52, p = .13. The total number of

teachers working with them was 73 (58 male and 15 female

teachers).

Instruments

Our respondents were asked to fill out three questionnaires

that were all adapted (parts) from existing instruments.

Burnout. The Dutch version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for

teachers (MBI-NL-Ed; Schaufeli & Van Horn, 1995) was used to

measure burnout. The instrument consists of twenty items, and is

divided into three sub-scales: (1) emotional exhaustion (8

items), (2) depersonalization (5 items) and (3) personal

accomplishment (7 items). The students could score on a 7-point

scale, from "never" to "always". Based on their students'

perceptions, teachers will suffer from burnout when the scores on

emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are high, and when the

scores on personal accomplishment are low. The wording of the

items has been adapted in such a way that the students'

perceptions could be reported. Examples of items indicating

emotional exhaustion are: "At the end of the working day my grade teacher feels empty" and "My grade teacher feels tired when he gets up in the morning, facing a new working day again". Examples of depersonalization items are: "My grade teacher has the feeling that he treats some students in an impersonal way" and "My grade teacher doesn't really care what will become of his students". Examples of items indicating personal accomplishment are: "When my grade teacher has finished instruction, he looks back on it full of satisfaction" and "My grade teacher has the feeling he achieves many things of great value in this job".

The three-factor structure of the Dutch version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for teachers has been validated in confirmatory factor analysis (Schaufeli, Daamen, & Van Mierlo, 1994). Cronbach's alpha for emotional exhaustion was .86, for personal accomplishment and depersonalization .72.

Teacher Competence. The second questionnaire (Coping with Disruptive Behavior Scale, CDBS; 12 items) consisted of an adapted version of the Self-efficacy Scale for Classroom Management and Discipline from Emmer and Hickman (1991). This instrument was used to measure the perceived teachers' competence to cope with disruptive student classroom behavior. Examples of the CDBS are "When my grade teacher is speaking, he is hardly ever interrupted by the students" and "My grade teacher knows how to restore order when a student disturbs his lesson". Cronbach's alpha was .94 for questionnaire 2.

Disruptive behavior. The third questionnaire (Perceived Disruptive Behavior Scale, PDBS; 5 items), measuring the perceived occurrence of disruptive student classroom behavior, consisted of an adapted version of the Order & Organization sub-scale of the Classroom Environment Scale from Moos and Tricket (1974). The students scored the items on a 6-point scale, from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Examples of the items in PDBS are "Sometimes it is too noisy in my grade teacher's classroom" and "There are quite a few students disrupting my grade teacher's lessons". Cronbach's alpha was .86 for questionnaire 3.

Both questionnaire 2 and 3 had first been translated into Dutch and were later adapted to our purposes. So as not to deviate from the original intentions of the authors of the questionnaires, we asked an independent translator to turn our Dutch translations back into English. It was probably the most reliable way to have our instruments reflect the English meaning as accurately as possible.

Results

Table 1 shows the means, the standard deviations and the internal consistencies of the three burnout dimensions of the MBI, the CDBS and the PDBS. Besides the scores of the total sample, the separate scores of male and female students, eta squared and the correlations between the variables are presented.

The results show that the reliability coefficients of our questionnaires range from .72 to 94, which is sufficient according to Nunnally and Bernstein's criterion (1994).

Insert Table 1 about here

According to the students' perception, the teachers' mean score on emotional exhaustion is 13.37, on depersonalization 7.42, and on personal accomplishment 21.86.

Because the current study involved more than one test, we adjusted the alpha level downward to consider chance capitalization (Sankoh, Huque, & Dubey, 1997; Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). There is a significant difference between the perceptions of male and female students in respect of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization among their grade teachers. The mean score of male students on symptoms of emotional exhaustion is significantly higher than the mean score of female students: $t(409) = 2.82$, $\underline{p} < .01$. Male students differ significantly from their female counterparts by reporting a higher mean score on depersonalization: $t(409) = 4.18$, $\underline{p} < .01$. There are no differences between male and female students in respect of personal accomplishment: $t(409) = 1.48$, $\underline{p} > .05$. The magnitude of the differences in the mean scores were small. Eta's squared are .02, .04, and .01, respectively.

Questionnaire 2 explored students' perceptions of the teachers' competence to cope with disruptive student behavior,

and questionnaire 3 investigated students' perceived occurrence of disruptive student classroom behavior. According to the students, the teachers' mean score on competence to cope with disruptive student behavior is 34.44, and on the occurrence of perceived disruptive student behavior 11.08. There is no significant difference between male and female students in respect of the teachers' coping skills: $t(409) = 1.92$, $\underline{p} > .05$. Finally, the results also show that there is no significant difference between male and female students' scores as far as disruptive student behavior is concerned: $t(409) = 1.98$, $p > .05$. The magnitude of the differences in the mean scores were very small; both eta's squared are .01.

Insert Table 2 about here

Table 2 shows students' perceptions of the incidence of perceived burnout dimensions among their classroom teachers and perceived disruptive behavior of their fellow students. The separate scores of six student age categories are presented. We omitted the ages 22 and 23 in the analyses because there were too few students of these ages (2 and 1, respectively). A multivariate analysis of variance was performed in order to assess the effect of age categories on the three perceived burnout dimensions and perceived disruptive student behavior. To check for normality, linearity, univariate and multivariate outliers, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, and

multicollinearity, preliminary assumption testing was conducted.
We did not observe serious violations. We obtained a Wilk's
Lambda value of .929, with a significance value of .238
suggesting that separate student age categories do not
characterize teachers differently in terms of burnout dimensions
and disruptive behavior.

A hierarchical regression analysis was carried out in order
to examine to what extent the teachers' competence to cope with
disruptive student behavior, and perceived disruptive student
behavior would explain the teachers' burnout level. In doing so,
the variables student gender, teacher gender, and student age
were controlled for statistically. With each burnout dimension as
the dependent variable, these control variables were first added
to the regression equation (step 1), followed by the independent
variables, i.e. the competence to cope with disruptive student
behavior, and perceived disruptive student behavior (step 2).

Insert Table 3 about here

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses - see
Table 3 - show that the variable competence to cope with
disruptive student behavior added in step 2 is a significant
predictor of the burnout dimensions emotional exhaustion (β = -
.75, p < .001), depersonalization (β = -.69, p < .001) and
personal accomplishment (β = .62, p < .001). Perceived disruptive

student behavior is significantly related to both emotional
exhaustion (β = .13, p < .05) and depersonalization (β = .14, p <
.05). The total of the variance explained of the predicting
variables in steps 1 and 2 was 44% for emotional exhaustion, 40%
for depersonalization and 46% for personal accomplishment.

We also found that emotional exhaustion is significantly
related to teacher gender, but not to the age or gender of the
responding students. Furthermore, it is an interesting finding
that of all the dependent variables depersonalization shows the
most significant relationship with the independent variables.
This dimension of burnout is, for instance, significantly related
to student age.

Discussion

This study is different from many other studies on burnout,
because the questionnaires used to provide us with information on
a specific group of teachers have been completed by their
clients, i.e. the students. Moreover, our study is embedded in
the social cognitive theory, in particular the self-efficacy
theory, which claims to elucidate someone's domain specific
behavior (Bandura, 1997). In our case, the teachers' competence
to cope with classroom behavior was measured with the
questionnaire CDBS, which complies with the criteria advised in
some studies (Brouwers, 2000; Forsyth & Cary, 1998) in order to
obtain accurate self-efficacy scores.

It was our first aim to examine whether the MBI and the two
other self-report instruments (CDBS and PDBS) could be adapted to

students to report perceived burnout symptoms among their teachers. The reliability of the questionnaires was .72 and higher, a noteworthy result. In respect of the data acquired, it may be concluded that students appear to be a source of valuable information on their teachers and classroom processes.

Second, we also examined the students' perceptions of the level of burnout among their grade teachers, the occurrence of perceived disruptive student behavior, and the students' perception of their teachers' competence to cope with this kind of behavior. In comparison with other studies on teacher burnout, our study not only presents the students' perceptions of their grade teachers, but it is also distinctive in having a large number of respondents reporting about a specific group of teachers working in the same social and organizational setting. The variables that often influence burnout research findings, i.e. type of school, number of students taught (Burke & Greenglass, 1989), and grade level taught (Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997) were homogeneous in our study, and may have added to the validity of our results.

The present study was conducted among vocational students in their late teens and early twenties at a Regional Training Center, which may offer an explanation for the low levels of burnout symptoms among teachers as perceived by their students in comparison with some other studies that derived their results from self-report questionnaires (Byrne, 1991; Evers, Tomic, & Brouwers, 2001; Evers, Brouwers, & Tomic, 2002).

According to Scarlett (1988) "…the curriculum can be an important determinant of behavior" (p. 174). As our respondents attend practical training programs, preparing them for specific jobs, they may be (1) extra motivated during the lessons, which in turn may increase (2) their positive attitude towards education and teachers, factors that positively influence teachers, as well. The educational setting described above may very well explain the relatively low perceived scores on the various dimensions of burnout among the grade teachers.

Third, we did not find any significant age-related differences in the respondents' scores. In the literature, results sometimes do show differences between younger (12-year-old) and older (19-year-old) pupils in respect of e.g. school discipline (Haroun & O'Hanlon, 1997). The older students in Haroun and Hanlon's study have a more balanced judgment on the necessity of school discipline and good student behavior, which is in accordance with the serious and balanced way our respondents approached the questions raised in this study. However, the greater age homogeneity of our students in comparison with the pupils in Haroun and O'Hanlon's study (1997) may explain the absence of significant differences between the younger and older respondents.

Fourth, we examined whether the students' gender played a role in our results. We found significant differences between the reports of male and female students in respect of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Male students appeared to more

frequently report perceived symptoms of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Interestingly, these results coincide with the results of the teachers' self-reports in Burke et al. (1996), indicating that male teachers have significantly higher scores on these two burnout dimensions. There was no difference between male and female respondents' perceptions of the teachers' level of personal accomplishment.

According to Jules and Kutnick (1997), female students appear to be more sensitive to classroom-related problems, which may be due to the female students' greater expectations of good interpersonal relationships. Our study, however, shows that female students did not report significantly more student disruptive behavior than their male counterparts.

Fifth, supplementary to Tatar and Yahav (1999), we incorporated the variables disruptive student behavior and the teachers' competence to cope with it in this study. These variables are found to be related to teacher burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 1998, 1999; Burke et al., 1996; Friedman, 1995; Hock, 1988; Lamude, Scudder, & Furno-Lamude, 1992). The students' reported perceptions on disruptive classroom behavior are significantly related to the three dimensions of teacher burnout. The results also show that grade teachers' competence to cope with disruptive student behavior is significantly related to each dimension of burnout. This is quite an interesting finding. According to a recent study on the dimensions of burnout (Van Dierendonck, Schaufeli, & Buunk, 2001), personal accomplishment,

which is significantly related to someone's competence (Brouwers & Tomic, 1998, 1999; Evers et al., 2001), may be a decisive factor in the teachers' strategies for coping with job stressors. Van Dierendonck et al. (2001) found that when the level of personal accomplishment had decreased, emotional exhaustion and depersonalization significantly increased. Teachers in our study frequently meet with disruptive student behavior, but because of their perceived competence to cope with it, they score relatively high on personal accomplishment, and relatively low on depersonalization and emotional exhaustion.

This study is one of the few attempts to have students report on perceived symptoms of burnout among their teachers. It can be concluded that the perceived level of burnout among the classroom teachers is rather low. This may be so because the student population at this RTC has left the difficult adolescent years behind, and because of the large minority of female students: both factors are known to contribute to positive teacher student relations (Levine et al., 1996). Positive social relations with students are conducive to a positive classroom climate, which appears to be one of the important factors in the prevention of the burnout dimension emotional exhaustion (Byrne, 1994; Miller, 1999). If students report positively about the grade teachers' behavior and about favorable and constructive social interactions with them, it may be concluded that at least two prerequisites for teacher well-being have been met. In connection with this, our results confirmed findings of various authors who found that

21

disruptive student behavior appears to be a significant contributor to depersonalization, one of the conspicuous dimensions of teacher burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 1998, 1999; Friedman, 1995; Punch & Tuettemann, 1990; Tatar & Yahav, 1999).

Burnout among teachers can not be denied, but many of the monographs published on measuring the symptoms and preventing its onset lack a firm theoretical basis. With the help of a comprehensive theory such as the self-efficacy theory, burnout researchers would not have to re-invent the theoretical wheel once again; instead they could depart from a common starting point in their investigations. Furthermore, support should be found for a multifaceted method of measuring burnout symptoms among teachers. According to Farber (2000) there are at least three types of teacher burnout, so it would be advisable to measure burnout among homogeneous groups of teachers working at e.g. one institution or in one subject. The suggestions made above, will make it easier for physicians and psychologists to decide which kind of burnout a teacher is suffering from, and which specific measures can be taken to prevent the onset, the development, or aggravation of burnout symptoms.

Finally, like Batten (1988), we embrace the idea that pupils and students can help clarify and understand the process of teaching. Educating young people is not a unilateral, but an interactional process involving teachers and students. The participants' views of this process, their interests and worries should be given equal attention in study programs and everyday

school-life, for education can only thrive in an environment of

mutual respect and interests, in an environment that is not

troubled by conflicts or harassment.

References

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Batten, M. (1988). Teacher and pupil perspectives on the positive aspects of classroom experience. *Scottish Educational Review, 21,* 48-57.

Blase, J. J. (1982). A social-psychological grounded theory of teacher stress and burnout. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18*(4), 93-113.

Blase, J. J. (1984). School principals and teacher stress: A qualitative analysis. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision, 1*(2), 35-43.

Brenner, S. O., Sorbom, D., & Wallius, E. (1985). The stress chain: a longitudinal confirmatory study of teacher stress, coping and social support. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 58,* 1-13.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (1998). Ordeverstorend gedrag van leerlingen, waargenomen eigen competentie en burnout onder leraren [Student disruptive behavior, perceived self-efficacy and burnout among teachers]. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor de Psychologie, 54,* 173-183.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (1999). Teacher burnout, perceived self-efficacy in classroom management, and student disruptive behavior in secondary education. *Curriculum and Teaching, 14*(2), 7-26.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(2), 239-254.

Burke, R. J., & Greenglass, E. (1989). The clients role in psychological burnout in teachers and administrators. *Psychological Reports, 64*, 1299-1306.

Burke, R. J., Greenglass, E. R., & Schwarzer, R. (1996). Predicting teacher burnout over time: Effects of work stress, social support, and self-doubts on burnout and its consequences. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 9*(3), 261-275.

Burke, R. J., & Richardsen, A. M. (1996). Stress, burnout, and health. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.), *Handbook of Stress, Medicine, and Health* (pp. 101-117). Boca Raton, Fl.: CRC Press, Inc.

Byrne, B. M. (1991). Burnout: Investigating the impact of background variables for elementary, intermediate, secondary, and university educators. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 72*, 197-209.

Byrne, B. M. (1994). Burnout: Testing for the validity, replication, and invariance of causal structure across elementary, intermediate, and secondary teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 31*(3), 645-673.

Cherniss, C. (1980). *Professional burnout in human service organizations.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Dworkin, A. G. (1985). *When teachers give up: Teacher burnout, teacher turnover and their impact on children* (78713-7998). Austin, TX: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.

Emmer, E. T., & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51*, 755-765.

Eskridge, D., & Coker, D. (1985). Teacher stress: Symptoms, causes, and management techniques. *The Clearing House, 58*, 387-390.

Evers, W., Tomic, W., & Brouwers, A. (2001). Effects of aggressive behavior and perceived self-efficacy on burnout among staff of homes for the elderly. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 22*, 439-454.

Evers, W. J. G., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2002). Burnout and self-efficacy: A study on teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*(June), 227-245.

Feitler, F., & Tokar, E. (1980). Getting a handle on teacher stress: How bad is the problem? *Educational Leadership, 39*, 456-457.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1975). The staff burnout syndrome in alternative institutions. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, & Practice, 12*, 72-83.

Friedman, I. A. (1995). Student behavior patterns contributing to teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Research, 88*(5), 281-289.

Galloway, D., Boswell, K., & Pankhurst, F. (1981). Stress in Teaching. *National Education, Dec*, 204-206.

26

Guglielmi, R. S., & Tatrow, K. (1998). Occupational stress, burnout, and health in teachers: A methodological and theoretical analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(1), 61-99.

Haroun, R., & O'Hanlon, C. (1997). Do teachers and students agree in their perception of what school discipline is? *Educational Review, 49*(3), 237-250.

Hendriks, A. A. J., Hofstee, W. K. B., & De Raad, B. (1999). The five factor personality inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences: An International Journal of Research into the Structure and Development of Personality and the Causation of Individual Differences, 27*(2), 307-326.

Hock, R. R. (1988). Professional burnout among public school teachers. *Public Personnel Management, 17*(2), 167-188.

Hofstein, A., Gluzman, R., Ben-Zvi, R., & Samuel, D. (1980). A comparative study of chemistry students' perceptions of the learning environment in high schools and vocational schools. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 17*(6), 547-552.

Huberman, M. (1993). Burnout in teaching careers. *European Education, 25*(3), 47-69.

Hughes, R. E. (2001). Deciding to leave but staying: Teacher burnout, precursors and turnover. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 12*(2), 288-298.

Jenkins, S., & Calhoun, J. F. (1991). Teacher stress: Issues and intervention. *Psychology in the Schools, 28*, 60-70.

Jules, V., & Kutnick, P. (1997). Student perceptions of a good

teacher: The gender perspective. *British Journal of*

Educational Psychology, 67, 497-511.

Kremer-Hayon, L., & Kurtz, H. (1985). The relation of personal

and environmental variables to teacher burnout. *Teaching and*

Teacher Education, 1(3), 243-249.

Lamude, K. G., Scudder, J., & Furno-Lamude, D. (1992). The

relationship of student resistance strategies in the

classroom to teacher burnout and teacher type-A behavior.

Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 7(4), 597-610.

Levine, T., Donitsa-Schmidt, S., & Zellermayer, M. (1996).

Student perceptions of classroom climate in a communicative

and computer-supported approach to writing instruction.

Research and Development in Education, 29(2), 94-103.

Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior, 5*, 16-22.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of

experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior, 2*, 99-

113.

Miller, L. (1999). Reframing teacher burnout: in the context of

school reform and teacher development in the United States.

In R. Vandenberghe & A. M. Huberman (Eds.), *Understanding and*

preventing teacher burnout (pp. 139-156). Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Moos, R. H., & Trickett, E. J. (1974). *Manual Classroom*

Environment Scale. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press,

Inc.

Nunnally, N. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory.* (Third Edition ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Oranje, A. H. (2001). *Van ouderenbeleid tot lerarentekort [From policy on elderly workers to teacher shortages]*. Nijmegen: Mediagroep KUN.

Punch, K. F., & Tuettemann, E. (1990). Correlates of psychological distress among secondary school teachers. *British Educational Research Journal, 16*(4), 369-382.

Raviv, A., Raviv, A., & Reisel, E. (1990). Teachers and students: Two different perspectives?! Measuring social climate in the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*(1), 141-157.

Sankoh, A. J., Huque, M. F., & Dubey, S. D. (1997). Some comments on frequently used multiple endpoint adjustments methods in clinical trials. *Statistics in Medicine, 16*, 2529-2542.

Scarlett, P. (1988). Discipline: Pupil and teacher perceptions. *Maladjustment and Therapeutic Education, 7*(3), 169-177.

Schaufeli, W. B., Daamen, J., & Van Mierlo, H. (1994). Burnout among Dutch teachers: An MBI-validity study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*(3), 803-812.

Schaufeli, W. B., Maslach, C., & Marek, T. (1993). *Professional burnout: Recent developments in theory and research.* Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Van Horn, J. E. (1995). *Maslach Burnout Inventory voor leraren (MBI-NL-Le). Voorlopige handleiding.*

[*Maslach Burnout Inventory for teachers. Preliminary guide*].

University of Utrecht: PAGO.

Selye, H. (1976). *The stress of life*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smith, M., & Bourke, S. (1992). Teacher stress: Examining a model

based on context, workload, and satisfaction. *Teaching and*

Teacher Education, 8(1), 31-46.

Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate*

statistics. (3rd Ed.). New York: Harper Collins College

Publishers.

Tatar, M. (1998). Teachers as significant others: gender

differences in secondary school pupils' perceptions. *British*

Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 217-227.

Tatar, M., & Yahav, V. (1999). Secondary school pupils'

perceptions of burnout among teachers. *British Journal of*

Educational Psychology, 69, 457-468.

Van Dierendonck, D., Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk, B. P. (1998). The

evaluation of an individual burnout intervention program: The

role of inequity and social support. *Journal of Applied*

Psychology, 83(3), 392-407.

Van Dierendonck, D., Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk, B. P. (2001).

Towards a process model of burnout: Results from a secondary

analysis. *European Journal of Work and Organizational*

Psychology, 10(1), 41-52.

Students' perceptions -

Table 1.
Internal Consistencies, Means, Standard Deviations of Students' Perception of the Three Burnout Dimensions, Competence Coping with Disruptive Student Behavior, Perceived Student Disruptive Behavior, and Correlation Coefficients

Variables	α	All Students N = 411 M	SD	Male Students N = 252 M	SD	Female Students N = 159 M	SD	η²	1	2	3	4	5
1. Student Age	-	18.17	1.22	18.10	1.21	18.30	1.24	.02	-				
2. Emotional Exhaustion	.88	13.37	8.39	14.29**	8.81	11.91	7.48	.02	-.06	-			
3. Depersonalization	.72	7.42	5.19	8.25***	5.29	6.10	4.74	.04	-.13*	.75*	-		
4. Personal Accomplishment	.83	21.86	7.90	21.40	7.89	22.59	7.88	.01	.03	-.63*	-.59*	-	
5. Competence Cope With Student Disruptive Behavior	.94	34.44	13.38	33.46	13.78	35.99	12.61	.01	.04	-.65*	-.57*	.67*	-
6. Perceived Disruptive Student Behavior	.86	11.08	6.22	10.61	6.02	11.82	6.47	.01	.00	-.43*	-.37*	.54*	.76*

* p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001

Students' perceptions -

Table 2.
Students' Perceptions of the Incidence of Burnout Dimensions and
Disruptive Behavior Among Their Teachers: Separate Scores of Six
Student Age Categories

Student Age	N	Emotional exhaustion		Deperson- alization		Personal accompli- shment		Competence to cope with disrupted behavior		Perceived disruptive behavior	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
16	23	16.2	10.3	9.2	6.1	18.1	6.3	27.5	14.7	9.3	6.6
17	111	13.5	8.8	8.0	5.6	22.3	8.2	35.3	14.7	11.1	6.9
18	126	13.7	8.8	7.4	5.2	22.1	7.9	34.4	14.0	11.4	5.9
19	91	12.3	7.0	6.9	4.9	22.1	8.0	36.0	11.1	11.6	6.1
20	47	12.6	7.5	6.6	4.1	21.7	7.6	33.2	10.8	10.4	5.3
21	10	16.4	9.4	6.3	3.4	19.6	6.9	30.3	14.0	8.4	5.3
Total	411	13.4	8.4	7.4	5.2	21.9	7.9	34.4	13.4	11.1	6.2

Students' perceptions -

Table 3.
Results of Regression Analysis for the Predicting Variables on Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment

Predictor Variables	Emotional Exhaustion				Depersonalization				Personal Accomplishment			
	B	Std. Error	ß	ΔR^2	B	Std. Error	ß	ΔR^2	B	Std. Error	ß	ΔR^2
Step 1				.02*				.06***				.01
Student Gender	-1.03	.66	-.06		-1.20	.43	-.11**		-.01	.62	.00	
Teacher Gender	-1.93	.80	-.09*		-1.83	.52	-.14***		.92	.74	.05	
Student Age	-.15	.26	-.02		-.35	.17	-.08*		.00	.25	.00	
Step 2				.42***				.34***				.45***
Competence Cope With Student Disruptive Behavior	-.47	.04	-.75***		-.27	.02	-.69***		.37	.03	.62***	
Perceived Student Disruptive Behavior	.18	.08	.13*		.12	.05	.14*		.00	.07	.08	
Overall F for Equation	62.75***				51.40***				67.98***			

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: **Students' Perceptions of the Incidence of Burnout Among Their Teachers**

Author(s): Welko Tomic

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY *Sample* TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY *Sample* TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY *Sample* TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1	2A	2B
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☒	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Welko Tomic, Ph.D., Faculty of Social Sciences	
Organization/Address: The Open University P.O. Box 2960, 6401 DL Heerlen The Netherlands	Phone: 045-5762539	FAX: 045-5762939
	E-Mail Address: welko.tomic@ou.nl	Date: Nov. 20, 2002

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone:	**301-552-4200**
Toll Free:	**800-799-3742**
FAX:	**301-552-4700**
e-mail:	**info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com**
WWW:	**http://ericfacility.org**

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2003)