

## The Effect of Leadership Styles of Principals on Teachers' Burnout at Russaifa Education Directorate In Jordan

Aieman Al-Omari \*, Sadeq Al-Shudaifat \* and Abdullah Abu Naba'h \*

Received Date: 3/6/2007

Accepted Date: 9/3/2008

**Abstract:** The problem investigated in this study the influence of leadership styles of principals on teachers' burnout as experienced by teachers. A total of 133 teachers and 106 principals answered and returned questionnaires from Russaifa Education District in Jordan. The Maslach Burnout Inventory, and the Administrative Styles Questionnaire were used in this study. The results of this study found that there were difference for principals' leadership styles related to position among the sample of study that principals perceived themselves more significant than teachers perception in the following leadership styles (1, 1), (1, 9), (9, 1), and (9, 9). No difference in burnout scores for each of the principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers was found. Teachers' burnout scores significantly differ depending on their experience in teaching. Nor was there any difference in burnout scores for each of the principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers related to school type. No difference in teachers' burnout scores related to the interaction among independent variables of the study. Finally, several recommendations were suggested for coping with teachers' stress and burnout that can contribute to better job performance. (**Keywords:** Leadership styles, Burnout, Principals, teachers).

تأثير الأنماط القيادية لمديري المدارس على الاحتراق النفسي لدى المعلمين  
في مديرية تربية الرصيفة في الأردن  
أيمن العمري، صادق الشديفات و عبدالله ابو نبعه، كلية العلوم  
التربوية، الجامعة الهاشمية، الزرقاء، الأردن.

ملخص: هدفت الدراسة التعرف إلى تأثير الأنماط القيادية لمديري المدارس على الاحتراق النفسي لدى المعلمين. وتكونت عينة الدراسة من 133 معلما ومعلمة، و106 مديرا ومديرة تم اختيارهم بالطريقة العشوائية من مديرية التربية والتعليم للواء الرصيفة. وتم استخدام مقياس ماسلاك للاحتراق النفسي MBI لقياس درجة الاحتراق النفسي عند المعلمين، ومقياس النمط الإداري ASQ لقياس إدراك مدير المدرسة لنمطه القيادي، وإدراك المعلمين لنمط قيادة مدير المدرسة. وأشارت النتائج إلى وجود فروق ذات دلالة بين مديري المدارس ومعلميهم في إدراك الأنماط القيادية لمديري المدارس، فكانت درجة إدراك مديري المدارس أعلى من درجة إدراك المعلمين للأنماط القيادية (1،1)، (1،9)، (9،1)، و (9،9). لم تظهر النتائج وجود فروق في متوسطات الاحتراق النفسي لدى المعلمين تعزى للأنماط القيادية لمديري المدارس كما يدركها المعلمون، وعدم وجود فروق في متوسطات الاحتراق النفسي لدى المعلمين تعزى لنوع المدرسة. ووجود أثر لمتغير الخبرة في التدريس على متوسطات الاحتراق النفسي لدى المعلمين، وعدم وجود أثر للتفاعل بين متغيرات الدراسة بأشكالها المختلفة على متوسطات الاحتراق النفسي للمعلمين. وفي النهاية قدمت الدراسة مجموعة من الاقتراحات التي يمكن أن تستخدم لتقليل من الاحتراق النفسي لدى المعلمين وذلك من أجل تحسين أدائهم الوظيفي في المستقبل. (الكلمات المفتاحية: أنماط قيادية، احتراق نفسي، مديرو مدارس، معلمون).

### Introduction

Organizations are changing. Traditional organizational forms are changing to flexible forms that allow them to meet unique demands. As a result, the nature of work is different now. So too are the workers, the work environment, and the work pressures that make up the core of these organizations different.

Schools are not exempt from these trends. It is likewise under tremendous pressure to change and adapt to meet the changing needs and demands of society and an equal changing world. Developing a capacity for change and ridding itself of unnecessary processes and administrative structures will be a critical challenge (Duderstadt, 1999).

The pressures and challenges inherent in the modern workplace have resulted in a phenomenon called "burnout" which is affecting many of the brightest and most enthusiastic talents in the helping professions (Vash, 1980). Stress, which often leads to burnout, is becoming the number one cause of managerial malfunction. Too much stress cripples and sometimes even kills (Conoway & Coleman, 1984).

Although burnout affects many professions, education is generally accepted as being a highly stressful profession today. Burnout is of specific relevance in the teaching profession. Furthermore, there are important reasons why burnout in education should not be ignored; burnout may greatly influence job retention and turnover. Farber (1984) is of the opinion that teacher burnout has already reached serious proportions. In a more extensive study on crisis in education, Farber (1991) asserts that teachers will look for alternative sources of satisfaction and explore other career possibilities. Other researchers examining the effects of job-related stress and burnout on faculty have

\* Faculty of Educational Sciences, The Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan..

© 2008 by Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.

reached similar conclusions on faculty intention to leave academia and seek other career opportunities (Barnes et al. 1998, Byrne 1991).

In Jordan, The results of Tawalbeh's (1999) study showed that computer teachers in Jordan exhibited a high level of burnout. The findings revealed no statistically significant differences in the levels of burnout which can be attributed to any of the independent variables, or to any 2-way interactions between these variables. Askar et al. (1986) studied the extent of burnout among secondary school teachers in the state of Kuwait and found relatively low degrees of burnout among Kuwaiti teachers, especially those with teaching experience between 5-9 years.

With more demands on teachers now more than ever before, many are experiencing symptoms of stress and burnout (Lombardi 1995). This may represent the general feeling in society that schools are not doing a good job of educating students. Public consensus is that teachers are partly to blame for this problem in our system of education.

Burnout has been associated with virtually all types of working settings, especially those which focus on helping people. Burnout as defined by Maslach and Jackson (1986) is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism based on three aspects of middle administrators' behavior: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. A proliferation of literature exists examining burnout in various helping professions, e.g., police work (Maslach & Jackson 1979), health care (Maslach 1979), counseling (Tiedeman 1979, Warnath 1979), education (Briscoe 1984, Metz 1979, Moore 1980, Zabel & Zabel 1980, Zghol, Khresha, & Khaldi 2002); protective services (Daley 1979), child care facilities (Maslach & Pines 1977, Pines & Maslach 1980), and social services (Bramhall & Ezell 1981).

Burnout is found among administrative ranks in all types of organizations (Fresudenberger 1977, Vash 1980). For example, Vash (1980) state that administrators are equally susceptible to burnout because of "too many years of trying to manage the unmanageable and change the unchangeable ... leaving a burnout shell where once a bright, young, enthusiastic administrator used to be" (p. 2). As early as 1977, Freudenberger stated that administrators in every field were reporting cases of burnout.

Persons in the middle administrative ranks and teachers are considered prime targets for job stress, which can eventually lead to burnout (Scott 1978, Vash 1980). Austin and Gamson (1983), Scott (1978), and Kanter (1979) state that middle administrators and teachers as middle administrators are targets for burnout due to the fact that they experience limited mobility within the organizational structure, a sense of powerlessness, and limited time and resources with

which to perform the multiplicity of roles they have been assigned.

An analysis of the work, problems, and burnout encountered by teachers has led the researchers to conclude that teachers are affected by the leadership styles of their principals (Bertrand, 1981; Cherniss, 1980). The study was designed to investigate a number of variables thought to be associated with teachers' burnout in Russaifa Education District.

Leadership styles have been examined and re-examined by observers of management for many years. As a result, a number of theories have evolved. Debate between those who contend that there is one best style of leadership and those who contend that situations call for different styles has continued for many years among theorists and researchers (Burke, 1982).

The point was further debated that the dominance of one style or the other depends on the specific situation (situational/ contingency leadership). This approach was advanced in the model of Hersey and Blanchard (1982) and Fiedler (1967). The normative model of leadership contends that there is one best form of leadership which involves a simultaneous high concern for production and concern for people. Blake and Mouton (1978) define this model. The Blake Mouton Managerial Grid, through its accompanying assessment instruments, identifies five major or dominant grid styles: 1, 1 Caretaker Administration; 1, 9 Comfortable and Pleasant Administration; 9, 1 Authority-Obedience Administration; 9, 9 Team Administration; and 5, 5 Constituency-Centered Administration. These five styles represent the basic styles and are typical of most administrators. The Grid measures two dimensions of leadership: concern for production and concern for people. These two variables are plotted along two axes. The two dimensions are independent of each other, resulting in the leader being high or low on both axes, or high on one and low on the other.

However, several recognize grid combinations have been recognized for use as well (Blake & Mouton, 1985; Blake, Mouton & Williams, 1981). One combination approach cited in the Academic Administrator Grid is the 9+9 approach to administration which is a combination of 9, 1 and 1, 9 styles. This style is commonly referred to as Paternalism/ Maternalism Administration, and is very important to academic administration (Blake et al., 1981).

Most burnout literature suggests that a relationship exists between leadership styles and burnout. This connection is validated in the works of Savicki and Cooley (1982) and Boenisch (1983). Savicki and Cooley (1982) identified several organizational variables which are possible causes of burnout. Boenisch (1983) found that as a group, student services

professionals who rated themselves as having a low concern for people and a low concern for tasks (1, 1) reported high levels of stress. The more integrated leadership styles (5, 5 moderate concern for people and performance, and 9, 9 simultaneous high concern for people and performance) reported less stress. These findings were important to the present study since they explore the effect of leadership style on burnout.

A further review of the literature shows a number of studies that focus on leadership styles in public school administration (Baker 1979, Gilbert 1981, Gilligan 1982, King 1980, Watson 1980). One such study by King (1980) deals with the relationship between stress and the leadership style of school managers. King hypothesized that task-oriented managers would exhibit more stress than would relationship-oriented managers. Participants included 104 practicing school managers enrolled in the doctoral program in school management at the University of La Verne. Stress was measured by the Heimler Scale of Social Functioning and leadership was measured by the Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale. The study revealed no statistically significant relationships between leadership style and level of stress of school managers. There are no significant relationships between the demographic variables and stress. King (1980) also reports that 90% of the subjects choose the relationship-oriented style of leadership over the task-oriented style of leadership.

Zghol et al. (2003) aimed at investigating the burnout level among Kerak public high school teachers and its relationship to their perception of principal leadership behavior. The results of the study showed a high degree of burnout on emotional exhaustion and a moderate degree of burnout on depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. Also, there are significant differences in the degree of burnout among teachers due to gender, the highest degrees of burnout obtaining among male teachers. In addition, there are significant differences on the degree of burnout among teachers due to consideration (relationship-oriented) levels. The results revealed that the highest degrees of burnout are related to low level of consideration. On the other hand, there are no significant differences in the degree of burnout among teachers due to the level of initiating structure.

Glass et al. (1993) are of the opinion that general principles related to stress, burnout and coping must be further developed for application to the education environment. Strategies to address burnout may need to be different for educators working in basic, secondary, and post-secondary institutions of education. Generalizations about stress, burnout and coping will be safer between jobs that are similar on most relevant dimensions than between jobs that differ on several of them.

Successful burnout prevention and treatment efforts often require both individual and organizational changes to be effective, rather than one or the other. Individuals must develop effective personal strategies to regain in control and reduce their level of stress. Similarly, organizations must help their employees by using organization strategies to reduce work stress and ameliorate the effects of burnout in the work environment.

Manthey (1990) writes that "Leaders are people who influence others by how they act and what they say" (p. 19). The principal's leadership behavior needs to be identified and evaluated for its influence on the degree of burnout experienced by the teachers. Therefore, this study investigates the influence of perceived leadership styles of principals on teachers' burnout at Russaifa Education District in Jordan.

### **Statement of the problem**

A number of variables have been associated with burnout in public education settings, but there is some indication that certain leadership styles may lead to a higher incidence of burnout (Boenisch 1983). Burke (1982) suggests that females may be at a higher risk of burnout than other groups. A number of demographic variables including age, years of experience, and marital status have been studied in burnout research.

The burnout literature over the last decades has increased as attempts have been made to determine why employees develop stress-related disorders at the workplace. Although initially associated with helping professions such as nursing, social services, police work, and teaching (Maslach 1976, Vash 1980), teachers in the area of public schools in all probability face many of the same kinds of problems or circumstances as do other human services professionals. As in all human services or helping professions, the problems and circumstances that teachers face expose them to prolonged stress and subsequently to burnout (Kanter 1979).

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effect of leadership styles of principals on teachers' burnout in Russaifa education district. Selected demographic variables (years of experience in teaching, teachers' gender, and school type) are investigated to determine their effect on burnout among teachers in Russaifa education district.

### **Importance of the study**

This study is important in that it attempted to identify the effect of leadership styles of principals on teachers' burnout in russaifa education district. Kalimo and Mejman (1987) summarized from a comprehensive review of studies on the burnout syndrome that can be included, such as low morale, a negative attitude towards patients, clients, or similar types of person at work, a cynical attitude towards the achievement of

working goals, exaggerated confidence expressed in overt behavior, absenteeism, frequent changes of job, and other escapist behavior such as using drugs. At the cognitive level, a burned-out individual will likely feel helpless, hopeless and powerless (Schaufeli & Enzmann 1998).

It is implied by Boenisch (1983) that certain leadership styles may be associated with burnout among workers. Burke (1982) notes that females are at significant risk of developing burnout. Demographic variables identified in the literature are studied to determine their impact on the incidence of burnout experienced by teachers.

Further, this study may add valuable information to the existing literature on burnout among teachers in public educational settings. This study may also promote further studies on burnout among public school teachers, and identify leadership styles which promote individual effectiveness and reduce stress and burnout.

Therefore, this study put attempted to add to the body of knowledge describing leadership styles of principals and public education teachers' burnout. Researchers (Cherniss 1980, Cordes & Dougherty 1993, Golumbiewski & Munzenrider 1988, and Maslach et al. 2001) have recommended additional study of the burnout phenomenon including variables not typically addressed in order to expand the knowledge base. The specific population of this study will be teachers in public education. The effects of their burnout will affect significantly not only the current student body, but also the pool of prospective students, the teachers themselves, and the schools. The culture and economy of Jordan is dependent upon public education for significant educational and cultural development and maintenance.

### Research questions and hypotheses:

The following research questions were formulated to guide the research:

#### 1- Do principals perceive their leadership styles differently from their teachers?

**Hypothesis One:** There is no difference between the principals' perceptions of their leadership styles and the teachers' perception of the principals' leadership styles.

#### 2- What is teachers' burnout degree?

#### 3- What effect, if any, do principals' leadership styles, years of experience in teaching, teachers' gender, school type, and the interactions among these variables have upon teachers' burnout in public schools?

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no difference in teachers' burnout scores for each of the principals'

leadership styles as perceived by teachers in public schools.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no difference in burnout scores associated with the number of years of teachers' experience in teaching.

**Hypothesis Four:** There is no difference in burnout scores due to teachers' gender.

**Hypothesis Five:** There is no difference in teachers' burnout scores due to school type.

**Hypothesis Six:** There is no difference in burnout scores due to the interactions among independent variables of the study.

### Limitation of the study

The conclusions drawn from the results were subject to the following limitations: Results of this study are generalized only to those teachers who work in Russaifa education district in the academic year 2006/2007.

### Operational definitions

The following definitions are used throughout the study.

**Leadership styles:** Leadership styles are behaviors, which provide direction and structure for the task, and show consideration for the followers' needs (Burke, 1980).

Leadership styles in this study are defined operationally as those five basic styles that are measured by the subjects who are responding to the Administrative Style Questionnaire (ASQ) in the context of their perceptions of the leadership styles.

**Burnout:** Burnout is defined as the subjects' response to the three subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment) of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach & Jackson, 1986).

- A high degree of burnout is reflected in high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscales.

- An Average degree of burnout is reflected in average scores on the three subscales.

- A low degree of burnout is reflected in low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in high scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale.

### Methodology

#### Population and sample of the study

The target population for this study was defined as all principals and teachers at Russaifa Education District in Jordan. The list of the Ministry of Education showed

that the number of public schools' principals was (150) and (2118) teachers. The sample consisted of all (150) public schools' principals and (200) teachers selected randomly for the second semester of academic year 2006/ 2007. With regard to the sample description, a total of 133 teachers (76 male and 57 female), and 106 principals (58 male and 48 female) returned questionnaires. In relation to school type those teachers chosen from; 88 teachers chosen from Basic schools, and 45 teachers chosen from Secondary schools.

### Instruments of the study

#### *The Administrative Styles Questionnaire*

The Administrative Styles Questionnaire (ASQ), which is based on the Managerial Grid concept of Blake and Mouton (1985) and the Academic Administrator Grid concept of Blake et al (1981), was used to measure perceived subject and principal leadership styles. The Administrator Grid is represented as a grid with *concern for production* as the X-axis and *concern for people* as the Y-axis; each axis ranges from 1 (Low) to 9 (High). Blake et al (1981) specify five basic administrative styles in the Academic Administrator Grid; they identify several possible combinations involving (9, 1) and (1, 9) administrative styles. The combination which the authors suggested for use in academic administration was the style labeled 9+9 or Paternalism/ Materialism Administration. This 9+9 administrative style will constitute the sixth style designation used for the remainder of this study.

Six areas of leadership behavior were assessed through the Grid questions: (a) making decisions, (b) holding convictions, (c) managing conflict, (d) controlling temper, (e) expressing humor, and (f) exerting effort. Each of the six areas was designed to assess the administrator's concern for institutional performance and concern for people. The Administrative Styles Questionnaire was composed of 36 statements: six statements relating to each of the six areas on leadership behavior.

The individual's Grid style was represented by one or more of six basic designations.

1, 1: Caretaker Administration. Little concern for institutional performance characterizes this style, and low involvement in exercising power and authority is typical of this leader. Because of a lack leadership, subordinates involvement is likely to be

low. Questions 2, 12, 13, 24, 28, and 34 represent this style designation.

9, 1: Authority-Obedience Administration. This administration has a high concern for institutional performance yet a low concern for people. The major trust is to get results, exercise power and authority in a unilateral way, and extract obedience from subordinates. Questions 3, 8, 18, 19, 26, and 33 represent this designation.

1, 9: Comfortable and Pleasant Administration. Institutional performance is low, and concern for people is high in this orientation. The general belief is that when people are happy, results will take care of themselves and that there will be no need for supervision. Questions 1, 11, 15, 21, 29, and 36 represent this designation.

5, 5: Constituency-Centered Administration. The emphasis in this orientation is on moderate institutional performance coupled with moderate concern for people. There is a balance between results and people, so that neither dominates. This administration attempts to gain acceptable results by doing whatever is expected by the superior and simultaneously avoiding actions that lead to criticism. Questions 4, 19, 17, 20, 30, and 32 represent this designation.

9, 9: Team Administration. This orientation involves integration of concern for institutional performance with simultaneously high concern for people. Subordinates are encouraged to achieve the highest possible performance in terms of quality, quantity, and personal satisfaction. Involvement is generated in people who are able to mesh their individual efforts for the accomplishment of meaningful goals that are both sound and creative. Questions 5, 9, 16, 22, 27, and 31 represent this designation.

9+9: Paternalism/ Materialism Administration. This orientation emphasizes a 9, 1 concern for performance coupled with a 1, 9 motivated approval-giving for compliance. Control of subordinates is maintained by creating a relationship of obligation in such a way as to gain the warmth and affection of subordinates. Questions 6, 7, 14, 23, 25, and 35 on the ASQ reflect the 9+9 orientation.

To ensure equivalence of meaning of the items, and constructs between the Arabic and English items of the

ASQ, a translation process was used to include forward and backward translation. The goal of the translation process was to produce Arabic items of the ASQ that were equivalent in meaning to the original English items.

The researchers in this study tested the reliability of the Arabic version of the ASQ with a sample of 24 teachers different than that of the study but withdrawn from the same population. Chronbach coefficient alpha estimates of reliability coefficients of .85 for Caretaker Administration, .88 for Authority - Obedience Administration, .73 Comfortable and Pleasant Administration, .87 Consistency - Centered Administration, .79 Team Administration, and .84 Paternalism/ Materialism Administration for the ASQ. Twelve specialists in the field of educational administration assessed the validity of the questionnaire.

Scores for the Administrative Styles Questionnaire were derived by adding the weighted ranks for each statement. Each of the six statements on the six areas of leadership behaviors represents a Grid style designation. Columns are summed and total scores are derived for each of the grid styles. The column with the highest score represents the dominant leadership style. The statements have been randomly placed and are in no particular order. The use of a scoring key shows which statements are 1, 1; 9, 1; 1, 9; 5, 5; 9, 9; and 9+9. The Administrative Styles Questionnaire is easily understood and can be administered in 15 minutes.

In order to accommodate both principals and teachers, the researchers varied instructions to reflect when the questionnaire was a self-rating of the individual completing it or a rating for someone else as perceived by the individual.

#### **Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educator Survey (MBI-ES.)**

The Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educator Survey (MBI-ES) was used to measure burnout in three areas: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. The emotional exhaustion (EE) subscale addresses feelings of being emotionally over extended and exhausted by an individual's work. The depersonalization (DP) subscale addresses an unfeeling and impersonal response an individual may exhibit toward a student or client in treatment or instruction. The personal accomplishment (PA) subscale addresses an individual's feelings of work competence and successful achievement. An individual's response frequency related to each of the subscales is assessed using a seven-point (0 to 6) fully anchored response format. The MBI-ES authors recommend reporting personal accomplishment as actual computations of the item scores rather than as diminished personal

accomplishment as the literature, history of development, and consistent use of the MBI have focused on that concept (Maslach et al 1996).

Burnout is not viewed as a dichotomous variable, but conceptualized as a continuous variable, ranging from low to moderate to high degrees of experienced feeling (Maslach et al. 1996: 5):

- A high degree of burnout is reflected in high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) and Depersonalization (DP) subscales and in low scores on the Personal Accomplishment (PA) subscales.
- An average/moderate degree of burnout is reflected in average scores on the three subscales.
- A low degree of burnout is reflected in low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) and Depersonalization (DP) subscales and in high scores on the Personal Accomplishment (PA) subscale (Maslach et al. 1996: 5).

Maslach et al. (1996) cite Iwanicki and Schwab's Chronbach coefficient alpha estimates of reliability coefficients of .90 for Emotional Exhaustion, .76 for Depersonalization, and .76 for Personal Accomplishment for the MBI-ES.

The Arabic version of the MBI-ES developed by Tahayneh & Issa (1996), Mukabalah & Salamah (1993) was used in this study. Tahayneh & Issa (1996), Mukabalah & Salamah (1993) presented the reliability for the MBI-ES by redistributing the questionnaire to a sample of specialists.

The researchers in this study tested the reliability of the MBI with a sample of 24 teachers different from that of the study but withdrawn from the same population. Chronbach coefficient alpha estimates of reliability coefficients of .85 for Emotional Exhaustion, .81 for Depersonalization, and .78 for Personal Accomplishment for the MBI-ES. The validity of the questionnaire was assessed by 12 specialists in the field of educational administration.

The MBI-ES is a twenty-two item, self-report instrument, with response categories ranging from 0, (= Never,) to 6, (= Every Day). Estimated time for respondents to complete the instrument is from 10 - 15 minutes. Scoring is accomplished by the researchers utilizing a provided scoring key. Individual scores for each of the three subscales are obtained by key the test authors provide, and are categorized according to provided charts indicating high degree of burnout, average degree of burnout, or low degree of burnout in relation to similar professionals according to norms provided. (Maslach et al. 1996).

**Design and data analysis**

The independent variables in this study were leadership styles (1, 1: Caretaker Administration, 9, 1: Authority-Obedience Administration, 1, 9: Comfortable and Pleasant Administration, 5, 5: Constituency-Centered Administration, 9, 9: Team Administration, and 9+9: Paternalism/ Materialism Administration) as measured by the Administrative Styles Questionnaire (ASQ), and demographic data (years of experience in teaching, teachers' gender, and school type).

The dependent variables were the three types of burnout (Emotional Exhaustion, Personal Accomplishment, and Depersonalization) as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory Educators Survey. The SPSS statistical package was used to analyze the research data.

**Results of the study**

**1- Do principals perceive their leadership styles differently from their teachers?**

**Hypothesis One: There is no difference between the principals' perceptions of their leadership styles and the teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership styles.**

Means and Standard Deviation for the Samples' Leadership Styles ((1, 1) (1, 9) (5, 5) (9, 1) (9, 9) and (9+9)) Regarding Their Position.

**Table 2: Means and Standard Deviation for the Samples' Leadership Styles ((1, 1) (1, 9) (5, 5) (9, 1) (9, 9) and (9+9)) Regarding Their Position**

Leadership styles	Position	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
(1, 1) Caretaker Administration	Principal	24.04	2.79	106
	Teacher	22.20	4.83	133
(1, 9) Comfortable and Pleasant Administration	Principal	21.76	2.50	106
	Teacher	20.45	4.01	133
(5, 5) Constituency-Centered Administration	Principal	20.82	2.64	106
	Teacher	20.42	4.14	133
(9, 1) Authority-Obedience Administration	Principal	22.73	2.58	106
	Teacher	21.14	4.76	133
(9, 9) Team Administration	Principal	22.41	2.46	106
	Teacher	21.20	4.28	133
(9+9) Paternalism/ Materialism Administration	Principal	20.77	3.84	106
	Teacher	20.47	3.87	133

Table 2 presents Means and Standard Deviation results which indicate that Principals are more (1, 1 Caretaker Administration) (M = 22.04) than teacher perceptions (M = 22.20); principals are more (1, 9 Comfortable and Pleasant Administration) (M = 21.76) than teachers' perceptions (M = 20.45); principals are more (9, 1 Authority-Obedience Administration) (M = 22.73) than teachers' perceptions (M =21.14); and

principals are more (9, 9 Team Administration) (M = 22.41) than teachers' perceptions (M = 21.20).

To test if there were differences in principals' leadership styles among the sample of the study based in their position A One-Way MANOVA as seen in Table 3 was used to determine if there were differences in principals' leadership styles among the sample of the study based in their position.

**Table 3: One-Way Multivariate Tests for Principals' Leadership Styles (1, 1) (1, 9) (5, 5) (9, 1), (9, 9) (9+9) for Sample Position**

Effect	Wilks' Lambda Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Position	.922	3.260	6	232	.004*

\* <.05

Univariate analysis test was conducted as a follow-up test to assess the effects of position on principals' leadership styles of the sample of the study.

**Table 4: ANOVA Summary for the Samples' Leadership Styles Regarding Their Position**

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Position	1, 1	200.196	1	200.196	12.176	.001*	
	1, 9	101.696	1	101.696	8.682	.004*	
	5, 5	9.424	1	9.424	.746	.389	
	9, 1	149.328	1	149.328	9.605	.002*	
	9, 9	85.318	1	85.318	6.610	.011*	
	9 + 9	5.305	1	5.305	.357	.551	
	Error	1, 1	3896.766	237	16.442		
		1, 9	2776.036	237	11.713		
		5, 5	2994.015	237	12.633		
9, 1		3684.630	237	15.547			
9, 9		3059.075	237	12.907			
9 + 9		3519.724	237	14.851			

\* <.05

Table 4 presents ANOVA results which indicate that principals' leadership style of the sample of the study ((1, 1) (F (1, 237) = 12.176, p=.001)); ((1, 9) (F = 1, 237) = 8.682, p =.004)); (9, 1)(F =1, 237) =.746, p =.002)); and (9, 9) (F (1, 237) = 85.318, p=.011) significantly differs for their position, that principals perceived themselves more significant than teachers' perception in the following leadership styles (1, 1), (1, 9), (9, 1), and (9, 9). Principals are more (1, 1) (M = 22.04) than teacher perceptions (M = 22.20); principals are more (1, 9) (M = 21.76) than teachers' perceptions (M = 20.45); principals are more (9, 1) (M = 22.73) than teachers' perceptions (M =21.14); and principals are more (9, 9) (M = 22.41) than teachers' perceptions (M = 21.20).

**2- What is teachers' burnout degree?**

To assess teachers' burnout degree, Means and Standard Deviation computed. At present, scores are considered high if they are in the upper third of the normative distribution, average if they are in the middle third and low if they are in the lower third. A high

degree of burnout is reflected in high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. An average degree of burnout is reflected in average scores on the three subscales. A low degree of burnout is reflected in low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in high scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale (Maslach et al., 1996).

**Table 5: Means and Standard Deviation for the teachers' burnout degree**

MBI Subscales	Range of Experienced Burnout		
	degree	Mean s Range	Mean & SD of this study
Emotional Exhaustion	Low	≤16	M = 35.87
	Average	17-26	SD = (11.45)
	High	≥27	
Depersonalization	Low	≤6	M = 15.05
	Average	7-12	SD = (6.04)
	High	≥13	
Personal Accomplishment	Low	≥39	M = 33.44
	Average	32-38	SD = (8.18)
	High	≤31	

The numerical cut-off points are shown in Table 5, which adapted from Maslach et al. (1996: 6).

Table 5 presents Means and Standard Deviation results which indicate that teachers burnout in a high degree, it reflected in high mean on the Emotional Exhaustion (M=35.87) and Depersonalization (M=15.05) subscales and in average mean on the Personal Accomplishment (M= 33.44) subscale.

**3- What effect, if any, do principals' leadership styles, years of experience in teaching, teachers' gender, school type, and the interactions among these variables have upon teachers' burnout in public schools?**

A Four-Way MANOVA was used to test the effect of the principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers, years of experience in teaching, teachers' gender, school type, and the interactions among these variables on teachers' burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) in public schools.

**Table 6: Four-Way Multivariate Tests Difference in Teachers' Burnout Scores due principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers, years of experience in teaching, teachers' gender, and school type**

Effect	Wilks' Lambda Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
Intercept	.048	545.727	3.00	83.000	.000
Principals' leadership styles	.903	.577	15.00	229.528	.891
Experience in teaching	.895	1.583	6.00	166.000	.015*
Teachers' gender	.868	4.223	3.00	83.000	.008*
School type	.975	.705	3.00	83.000	.552
Principals' leadership styles * Experience in teaching	.718	1.083	27.00	243.045	.360
Principals' leadership styles * Teachers' gender	.834	1.042	15.00	229.528	.413
Principals' leadership styles * School type	.881	.717	15.00	229.528	.766
Experience in teaching * Teachers' gender	.895	1.584	6.00	166.000	.155
Experience in teaching * School type	.917	1.230	6.00	166.000	.293
Teachers' gender * School type	.969	.900	3.00	83.000	.445
Principals' leadership styles * Experience in teaching * Teachers' gender	.857	1.475	9.00	202.151	.159
Principals' leadership styles * Experience in teaching * School type	.939	.584	9.00	202.151	.810
Principals' leadership styles * Teachers' gender * School type	.927	2.193	3.00	83.000	.095
Experience in teaching * Teachers' gender * School type	.786	3.540	6.00	166.000	.300
Principals' leadership styles * Experience in teaching * Teachers' gender * School type	1.000	.	.00	84.000	.

\* <.05

**Hypothesis Two: There is no difference in teachers' burnout scores for each of the principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers in public schools.**

The MANOVA results in Table 6 shows that there is no difference in burnout scores for the principals' leadership styles as perceived by teachers in public schools. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Hypothesis Three: There is no difference in burnout scores due to the experience in teaching for teachers.**

To assess the effect of Experience in teaching on teachers' burnout, the MANOVA results in Table 6 indicates that there is a difference in teachers' burnout scores for experience in teaching. The omnibus F Test was statistically significant (F=1.583; df = 6; p<.015). The null hypothesis was rejected.



Univariate analysis test was conducted as follow-up test to assess the effect of Experience in teaching (1-5 years, 6-10 years, and 11 years and over) on teachers' burnout variables (emotional exhaustion,

depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) see Table 7.

**Table 7:** ANOVA Summary for the Teaches' Burnout Scores due to Experience in Teaching for Teachers.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Experience in teaching	Emotional Exhaustion	63.764	2	31.882	.308	.736
	Depersonalization	21.130	2	10.565	.432	.650
	Personal Accomplishment	512.150	2	256.075	4.375	.016*
Error	Emotional Exhaustion	8802.390	85	103.558		
	Depersonalization	2076.426	85	24.429		
	Personal Accomplishment	4975.226	85	58.532		

\* <.05

Table 7 presents ANOVA results which indicate that teachers' burnout scores (Personal Accomplishment) significantly differ for their experience in teaching. To assess pairwise differences

among the levels of Experience in teaching for teachers' burnout, the Fischers LSD procedures (p =.05) was performed (Table 8).

**Table 8:** Fischers LSD Multiple Comparisons for Teachers' Burnout Scores (Personal Accomplishment) Regarding Their Experience in teaching

Dependent Variable	(I) TCHEXP	(J) TCHEXP	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Personal Accomplishment	1-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	-2.23	1.81	.439
		11 years and over	-4.96	1.50	.004*
	6-10 yrs	1-5 yrs	2.23	1.81	.439
		11 years and over	-2.73	1.77	.276
	11 years and over	1-5 yrs	4.96	1.50	.004*
		6-10 yrs	2.73	1.77	.276

\* <.05

The results in Table 9 indicate that in Personal Accomplishment teachers with short teaching experience (M = 30.54) differ significantly from teachers with long teaching experience (M = 35.14). That means teachers who have a high number of years of teaching experiences have higher Personal Accomplishment level than other teachers with a low number of years of teaching experience.

**Table 9:** Means and Standard Deviations for the Teachers' Teaching Experience on Teachers' Burnout

	TCHEXP	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Personal Accomplishment	1-5 yrs	30.54	1.428	49
	6-10 yrs	34.02	1.668	28
	11+ yrs	35.14	1.33	56

**Hypothesis Four: There is no difference in teachers' burnout scores due to teachers' gender.**

The MANOVA results in Table 6 indicate that there is a difference in teachers' burnout scores for teachers' gender. The omnibus F Test was statistically significant (F=4.223; df = 3; p<.008). The null hypothesis was rejected.

Univariate analysis test in Table 10 was conducted as a follow-up test to assess the effect of teachers' gender on the burnout variables (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment).

**Table 10:** ANOVA Summary for the Teachers' Burnout Scores Related to Their Gender.

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Teacher's gender	Emotional Exhaustion	416.242	1	416.242	4.019	.084
	Depersonalization	302.754	1	302.754	12.393	.001*
	Personal Accomplishment	42.379	1	42.379	.724	.397
Error	Emotional Exhaustion	8802.390	85	103.558		
	Depersonalization	2076.426	85	24.429		
	Personal Accomplishment	4975.226	85	58.532		

\* <.05

Table 10 presents ANOVA results which indicate that teachers' burnout scores on "Depersonalization" significantly differs for female (M=17.044) than male (M=14.593).

**Table 11: Means and Standard Deviations for the Teachers' Gender on Teachers' Depersonalization**

	gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Depersonalization	Male	14.593	.767	79
	Female	17.044	.796	54

**Hypothesis Five: There is no difference in burnout scores due to school type for teachers.**

The MANOVA results in Table 6 shows that there is no difference in teachers' burnout scores due to school type for teachers. The null hypothesis was not rejected. The omnibus F Test was not statistically significant ( $F=.705$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $p<.552$ ). The null hypothesis was not rejected.

**Hypothesis Six: There is no difference in burnout scores due to the interactions among independent variables of the study.**

The MANOVA results in Table 6 show that there is no difference in teachers' burnout scores due to the interactions among independent variables. The null hypothesis was not rejected.

### Discussion of Results

Principals and teachers differed significantly as to how each perceived the leadership style of the principal that agrees with studies of Zghol et al (2002), Austin and Gamson (1983), Scott (1978), and Kanter (1979). Principals perceived themselves more significant than teachers' perception in the following leadership styles: caretaker administrators, comfortable and pleasant administrators, authority-obedience administrators, and team administrators.

Results of this study indicate that teacher's burnout in a high degree, it reflected in high mean on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in average mean on the Personal Accomplishment subscale, which agrees with studies of Scott (1978), Vash (1980), Austin and Gamson (1983), Scott (1978), and Kanter (1979).

The analyses of the results of this study fail to statistically identify specific leadership styles that lead to burnout, which agrees with Bertrand (1981) and Cherniss (1980). Principals also may rate themselves according to how they would like to be seen by others rather than as they are. Blake et al (1981) note this to be the case with administrators in the seminars that they presented on leadership styles. It is also possible that teachers have certain biases based on their perceptions of their experience with their principals which prevent them from making an accurate rating of their principals' behavior.

Blake et al (1981) suggest that the 9, 9 (team administration) approaches to leadership can be expected to have an impact on reducing stress and burnout within academic administration. Principals preferred the 1, 1 (caretaker administration) approach; followed by 9, 1 (authority-obedience administration); then 1, 9 (comfortable and pleasant administration) and 9, 9 (team administration). Boenisch (1983), reports different findings which are ideal in terms of the position held by Blake, Mouton, and Williams (1981), who contend that 9, 9 represents the soundest approach to school management. Teachers' burnout scores significantly differ for their experience in teaching, which agrees with Askar et al (1986). The results in Table 9 indicate that in Personal Accomplishment teachers with short teaching experience (1-5 years) differ significantly from teachers with long teaching experience (11 years and more). That means teachers who have a high number of years of teaching experiences have higher Personal Accomplishment level than other teachers with a low number of years of teaching experience.

Results of study indicate that female teachers' have higher "Depersonalization" level than male teachers, which differs with Zghol et al (2003), who contend that the highest level of burnout obtaining among male teachers, and Tawalbeh (1999), reports different findings which are no statistically significant differences in the burnout level attributed to teachers' gender.

Also, the result of study indicates that there is no difference in teachers' burnout scores due to School Type, which differs with Askar et al (1986), who contend that relatively low degree of burnout found among secondary school teachers. Also, the result of the study indicates that there is *no difference in teachers' burnout scores due to the interactions among independent variables of the study (principals' leadership styles, years of experience in teaching, teachers' gender, and school type)*.

### Conclusions

The term burnout is used to describe the last stage of the negative process of experiencing unrelieved work stress that results in emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and feelings of decreased accomplishment. Although there might exist considerable interest, disagreement, and confusion over the definition and measurement of burnout, most researchers agrees that burnout is a negative reaction to or the result of job stress and leadership style of supervisors. In addition, descriptions of burnout in professional literature vary from an emotional response to varying levels of occupational stress, burnout, and leadership styles.

Burnout has also been described as a coping mechanism in which individuals distance themselves from clients to continue to work without being overly

affected by the personal interaction the job entails. According to the literature, the central thesis of the burnout syndrome is increased feelings of emotional exhaustion. In its entirety, the common element in the definitions and models of burnout is its relationship to a stressful work situation and styles of leadership. Burnout is perceived as a highly debilitating form of stress.

In recent years, the educational system has become the target of widespread scrutiny and criticism. The growing literature on educators' work-life has come in response to series of highly critical public criticisms of public education and teachers' performance.

The effects of burnout are varied and have received extensive attention in recent years. As educators enter the twenty-first century, organizational change will continue to be a major source for organization members in terms of work overload, lack of control, insufficient reward, absence of fairness or equity, work-home demands, and supervisors' leadership styles.

### Recommendations

Knowledge of self is always important as decisions and plans are made. This type of knowledge is just as important to the organizational self when strategic and tactical plans are made that involve the mobilization of the organizational human resource. As in all endeavors, without replication studies and the establishment of a "body" of knowledge any interpretation of these data without considered skepticism is ill advised. Based upon the findings and the conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made:

- Attention should be given to the no difference that showed in this study between the perception of leadership styles between the principals and teachers that work closely together. A more careful analysis of the data might be in order to discover these patterns
- It is possible that the findings of this study could be enhanced if additional methods of performance appraisal could be included. The inclusion of peer reviewers as well as evaluation by educational supervisors might strengthen the accuracy of assessing the influence of principals' leadership styles on teachers' burnout.
- Research that seeks to identify the various factors, associated with burnout, should be continued since current findings remain conflicting and inconclusive.
- This study should be replicated with a broader group of teachers and principals to explore whether detectable differences can be identified in the variables under study.
- Research should be conducted to determine whether the 9, 9 (team administration) approaches

does, in fact, reduce stress in organizational settings.

- Training programs should be developed to teach administrative strategies for coping with stress and burnout. A wide variety of intervention strategies may be trying, including stress inoculation training, relaxation, time management, assertiveness training, rational emotive therapy, training in interpersonal and social skills, teambuilding, management of professional demands, and meditation.

### References

- Austin, A.E. & Gamson, Z.F. (1983). *Academic workplace: New demands, heightened tensions* (Report No. 10). Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Askar, A., Jamea, H., & Al-Ansari, M. (1986). The extent of burnout among secondary school teachers in the State of Kuwait. *Educational Journal*, 3(10), 9-43.
- Baker, C.P. (1979). The relationship of the principal's leadership style and job satisfaction of teachers. Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 3004A.
- Barnes, L.L.B., Agago, M.O., & Coombs, W.T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(4), 457-469.
- Bertrand, U.S. (1981). Personal and organizational correlates of role stress and job satisfaction in female managers. Doctoral dissertation., University of Wisconsin. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 1051A.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1978). Should you teach there's only one best way to manage? *Training*, 15(4), 24-27.
- Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1985). *The managerial grid III*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Houston: Gulf.
- Blake, R.R., Mouton, J.S., & Williams, M.S. (1981). *The academic administrator grid*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bramhall, M., & Ezell, S. (1981). How burned out are you? *Public Welfare*, 39(1), 23-27.
- Briscoe, M.L. (1984). Reflections on academic burnout. *Association of Departments of English Bulletin*, 79, 1-7.
- Boenisch, E.W., Jr.(1983). Leadership style: Job type, stress, and satisfaction among community college student personnel professional. Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 44, 2336A.
- Burke, W.W. (1982). *Organization development: Principles and practices*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Byrne, J.J. (1991). Burnout: Investigating the impact of background variables for elementary, intermediate, secondary, and university educators. *Teaching and teacher Education*, 7(2), 197-209.

- Cherniss, C. (1980a). *Professional burnout in human service organization*. New York: Praeger.
- Cherniss, C. (1980b). *Staff burnout: Job stress in the human services*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Conoway, B., & Coleman, A.P. (1984). Burnout and school administrators: A review of literature. *Small School Forum*, 6(1), 1-3.
- Cordes, C.L., & Dougherty, T.W. (1993). A review and integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 621-656.
- Daley, M.R. (1979). Burnout: Smoldering problem in protective services. *Social Work*, 24, 375-379.
- Duderstadt, J.J. (1999). Can colleges and universities survive in the information age? In R.N. Katz & Associates (Eds.), *Dancing with the Devil: Information Technology and the New Competition in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Farber, B.A. (1984). Teacher burnout: Assumptions, myths, and issues. *Teachers College Record*, 86(2), 321-338.
- Farber, B.A. (1991). *Crisis in education: Stress and burnout in the American teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Freudenberger, H.J. (1977). Burnout: The organizational menace. *Training and Development Journal*, 31(7), 26-27.
- Glass, D.C., McKinght, J.D., & Valdimarsdottir, H. (1993). Depression, burnout and perceptions of control in hospital nurses. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 147-155.
- Gilbert, M.W. (1981). A study of the relationship of school principals' leadership style and occupational stress. Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 42, 4224A.
- Gilligan, T.P. (1982). An analysis of the leader style of elementary public school principals as perceived by their faculty. Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 43, 604A.
- Golembiewski, R.T., & Munzenrider, R.F. (1988). *Phases of burnout: Developments in concepts and application*. New York: Praeger Press.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed.. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kalimo, R., & Meiman, T. (1987). *Psychological and Behavioral Responses to Stress at Work*. In Psycho social Factors At Work And Their Relation to Health. 1987. Rajja Kalimo, Mostafa A. El-Batawi, and Cary L. Cooper (Eds). Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Kanter, R.M. (1979). *Changing the shape of work: Reform in academe* (Report No. 7). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- King, W.C. (1980). Relationship between stress and leadership style of school managers. Doctoral dissertation, University of LaVerne. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 4237A.
- Lombardi, J.D. (1995). Do you have teacher burnout? *Instructor*, 104(5), 64-65.
- Manthey, M. (1990). The nurse manager as leader. *Nursing Management*, 21(6), 18-19.
- Maslach, C. (1976). Burned-out. *Human Behavior*, 16-22.
- Maslach, C. (1979). The burnout syndrome and patient care. In C. Garfield (Ed.), *Stress and survival: The emotional realities of life-threatening illness*. St. Louis: Mosby.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S.E. (1979). Burned-out cops and their families. *Psychology Today*, 5, 59-62.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S.E. (1986). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (2ed ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., Jackson, S.E., & Leiter, M.P. (1996). *Maslach burnout inventory manual* (3re ed.). Palo Alto, Calif.: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Maslach, C., & Pines, A. (1977). The burnout syndrome in the day care setting. *Child Care Quarterly*, 6(2), 100-113.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M. (2001). Job burn-out. *Annual Review of Psychology: 2001*. Annual Reviews, Inc., p. 397. HWRC Document: A73234715, Gale Group, 2001.
- Metz, P.K. (1979). An exploratory study of professional burnout and renewal among educators. Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 40, 4308A.
- Moore, B.L. (1981). Differences in burnout among principals within categories of demographic variables. Doctoral dissertation, Bowling Green State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 4239A.
- Mukabalah, N, & Salamah, K. (1993). The burnout phenomenon among public school teachers in Jordan. *Damascus University Journal*, 9(33-34), 179-213.
- Pines, A.M., & Maslach, C. (1980). Combating staff burn-out in a day care center: a case study. *Child Care Quarterly*, 9(1), 5-16.
- Savicki, V., & Cooley, E. (1987). The relationship of work environment and client contact to burnout in mental health professionals. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65, 249-252.
- Schaufeli, W., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The Burn Out Companion to Study & Practice: a Critical Analysis*. Rotterdam: A. D. Donker-Rotterdam.
- Scott, R.A. (1978). *Lords, squires and yeomen: Collegiate middle managers and their organizations* (Report No. 7). Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.
- Tahayneh, Z., & Issa, S. (1996). Levels of burnout among physical education teachers in Jordan and

- their relation with some variables. *Dirassat-Educational Sciences*, 23(1), 131-148.
- Tawalbwh, M. (1999). Burnout levels among computer teachers in schools of Irbid, Mafraq, Ajloun, and Jerash Governorates. *Mu'tah Journal For Research and Studies*, 14(2), 169-195.
- Tiedeman, D.V. (1979). Burning and copping out of counseling. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 57, 328-330.
- Vash, C.L. (1980). *The burnout administrator*. New York: Springer.
- Warnath, C.F. (1979). Counselor burnout: Existential crisis or a problem for the profession? *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 57, 325-328.
- Watson, J.D. (1980). Teacher perceptions of the leadership behavior of superintendents of schools in negotiating and non-negotiating school districts in Kansas. Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41, 3376A.
- Zabel, R.H., & Zabel, M.K. (1982). Burnout: A critical issue for educators. *Education Unlimited*, 2(2), 23-25.
- Zghol,R., Khrysha, M., and Khaldi, M. (2003). Burnout among teachers and its relation to their perception of principals' leadership styles at public Kerak high school. *Mu'tah Journal For Research and Studies*, 18(6), 243-268.

## Administrative Styles Questionnaire

### Self Assessment

Six areas of leadership are identified in this questionnaire. In each area are statements, which describe various styles of leadership. Please read all of the statements and then rank each statement from 1-6 with 6 being your preferred style, 5 being your second most preferred style, 4 being your third most preferred style, 3 being your fourth most preferred style, 2 being your fifth most preferred style, and 1 being your least preferred leadership style. Each statement must be ranked differently. There can be no duplicate ranks.

#### Area 1: INITIATIVE,

- ( ) 1- I initiates actions that help and support others.
- ( ) 2- I put out enough to get by.
- ( ) 3- I drive myself and others.
- ( ) 4- I seek to maintain a steady pace.
- ( ) 5- I exert vigorous effort and cause others to join in enthusiastically.
- ( ) 6- I stress loyalty and extend appreciation to those who support his/ her initiatives.

#### Area 2: INQUIRY

- ( ) 7- I double-check what others tell him/ her and compliment them when I am able to verify their position.
- ( ) 8- I investigate the facts and positions so that he/ she is in control of any situation and to assure that others are not making mistakes.
- ( ) 9- I invite and listen for opinions and ideas different from my own. Continuously re-evaluates his/ her facts, beliefs, and positions.
- ( ) 10- I take things at face value and check facts and positions when obvious discrepancies appear.
- ( ) 11- I look for facts and positions that suggest all is well. Prefer harmony to challenge.
- ( ) 12- I go along with facts and opinions given him.

#### Area 3: ADVOCACY

- ( ) 13- I keep my own position and avoid taking sides by revealing true opinions or ideas.
- ( ) 14- I maintain strong convictions but permit others to express their ideas so that I can help them think more objectively.
- ( ) 15- I take the opinions and ideas of others even though I may have reservations.
- ( ) 16- I feel it is important to express his/ her convictions and respond to sound ideas by changing my mind.
- ( ) 17- I express opinions and ideas in a tentative way and try to meet others halfway.
- ( ) 18- I stand up for my opinions and ideas even though it means rejecting the views of others.

#### Area 4: CONFLICT

- ( ) 19- I try to cut it off or win my position.
- ( ) 20- I try to find a position that others find suitable.
- ( ) 21- I try to soothe feelings to keep people together.
- ( ) 22- I seek reasons for it in order to resolve the underlying causes.
- ( ) 23- I terminate it but thank people for expressing their views.
- ( ) 24- I remain neutral or seek to stay out of conflict.

#### Area 5: MAKING DECISIONS

- ( ) 25- I have the last say and make a sincere effort to see that his/ her decisions are accepted.
- ( ) 26- I place a high value on making my own decisions and rarely is influenced by others.
- ( ) 27- I place a high value on arriving at sound decisions based on understanding and agreement.
- ( ) 28- I allow others to make decisions or come to terms with whatever happens.
- ( ) 29- I look for decisions that maintain good relations and encourage others to make decisions.
- ( ) 30- I search for workable decisions that others will accept.

#### Area 6: CRITIQUE

- ( ) 31- I encourage two-way feedback to strengthen operations.
- ( ) 32- I give informal feedback regarding suggestions for improvement.
- ( ) 33- I identify weaknesses in my staff.
- ( ) 34- I avoid giving feedback.
- ( ) 35- I give others feedback and expect them to accept it because it is for their own good.
- ( ) 36- I encourage and praise when something positive happens, but avoid giving negative comments.

## **Administrative Styles Questionnaire**

### **Staff Assessment**

Six areas of leadership are identified in this questionnaire. In each area are statements, which describe various styles of leadership. Please read all of the statements and then rank each statement as to how you perceive your immediate administrative supervisor. Rank each statement on a scale from 1-6 with 6 being your perception of your administrator's most frequently observed style, 5 being his/ her second most frequently observed style, 4 being his/ her third most frequently observed style, 3 being his/ her fourth most frequently observed style, 2 being his/ her fifth most frequently observed style, and 1 being his/ her least observed leadership style. Each statement must be ranked differently. There can be no duplicate ranks.

#### **Area 1: INITIATIVE, My Administrator:**

- ( ) 1- initiates actions that help and support others.
- ( ) 2- puts out enough to get by.
- ( ) 3- drives himself and others.
- ( ) 4- seeks to maintain a steady pace.
- ( ) 5- exerts vigorous effort and causes others to join in enthusiastically.
- ( ) 6- stresses loyalty and extends appreciation to those who support his/ her initiatives.

#### **Area 2: INQUIRY, My Administrator:**

- ( ) 7- double-checks what others tell him/ her and compliments them when he/ she is able to verify their position.
- ( ) 8- investigates the facts and positions so that he/ she is in control of any situations and to assure that others are not making mistakes.
- ( ) 9- invites and listens for opinions and ideas different from his/ her own. Continuously re-evaluates his/ her facts, beliefs, and positions.
- ( ) 10- takes things at face value and checks facts and positions when obvious discrepancies appear.
- ( ) 11- looks for facts and positions that suggest all is well. Prefers harmony to challenge.
- ( ) 12- goes along with facts and opinions given him.

#### **Area 3: ADVOCACY, My Administrator:**

- ( ) 13- keeps his own position and avoids taking sides by revealing true opinions or ideas.
- ( ) 14- maintains strong convictions but permits others to express their ideas so that he/ she can help them think more objectively.
- ( ) 15- takes the opinions and ideas of others even though he/ she may have reservations.
- ( ) 16- feels it is important to express his/ her convictions and respond to sound ideas by changing his/ her mind.
- ( ) 17- expresses opinions and ideas in a tentative way and tries to meet others halfway.
- ( ) 18- stands up for his/ her opinions and ideas even though it means rejecting the views of others.

#### **Area 4: CONFLICT, My Administrator:**

- ( ) 19- tries to cut it off or win his/ her position.
- ( ) 20- tries to find a position that others find suitable.
- ( ) 21- tries to soothe feelings to keep people together.
- ( ) 22- seeks reasons for it in order to resolve the underlying causes.
- ( ) 23- terminates it but thank people for expressing their views.
- ( ) 24- remains neutral or seeks to stay out of conflict.

#### **Area 5: MAKING DECISIONS, My Administrator:**

- ( ) 25- has the last say and makes a sincere effort to see that his/ her decisions are accepted.
- ( ) 26- places a high value on making his/ her own decisions and rarely is influenced by others.
- ( ) 27- places a high value on arriving at sound decisions based on understanding and agreement.
- ( ) 28- allows others to make decisions or come to terms with whatever happens.
- ( ) 29- looks for decisions that maintain good relations and encourages others to make decisions.
- ( ) 30- searches for workable decisions that others will accept.

#### **Area 6: CRITIQUE, My Administrator:**

- ( ) 31- encourages two-way feedback to strengthen operations.
- ( ) 32- gains informal feedback regarding suggestions for improvement.
- ( ) 33- identifies weaknesses in his/ her staff.
- ( ) 34- avoids giving feedback.
- ( ) 35- gives others feedback and expects them to accept it because it is for their own good.
- ( ) 36- encourages and praises when something positive happens, but avoids giving negative comments.

**Maslach Burnout Inventory**

**Instructions:** This section tries to discover how teachers view their job and the people with whom they work closely. The statements presented are about job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, circle “0” (zero) on the rating scale. If you have had the feeling presented, indicate how often you feel it; circle a number from 1 to 6 on the scale that best describes how frequently you feel that way. Please answer every statement.

- 0 Never
- 1 A few times a year or less
- 2 Once a month
- 3 A few times a month or less
- 4 Once a week
- 5 A few times a week
- 6 Every day

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