5-2024

Association Between Minnesota Special Education Administrators' Level of Burnout and Job-Person Fit

Angela Lauderbaugh

Association Between Minnesota Special Education Administrators' Level of Burnout and Job-Person Fit

by

Angela M. Lauderbaugh

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

in Educational Administration and Leadership

May, 2024

Dissertation Committee:
Frances Kayona, Chairperson
Amy Christensen
Steven Emerson
Michele Barron-Albers

Abstract

Occupational burnout occurs when an individual experiences *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and a reduced sense of *personal accomplishment* (Leiter & Maslach, 2022). Educator burnout research focuses primarily on teachers (DeMatthews et al., 2021) with scarce research on special education administrators (Lashley & Boscardin, 2003). This quantitative study explored 213 Minnesota Special Education Administrators' perceived levels of burnout and degree of job-person fit using the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES) and the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) (Leiter & Maslach, 2011; Maslach et al, 2018).

The results found that those surveyed experience *emotional exhaustion* a few times a month, *depersonalization* a few times a year to once a month or less and *personal accomplishment* once a week to a few times a week. The greatest degree of job-person match was found in *values* with the poorest match in *fairness*. When disaggregated by demographic group varied levels of burnout and job-person fit were seen across groups. A moderate negative correlation was found between *emotional exhaustion* and *workload* and a weak negative correlation between *emotional exhaustion* and the other worklife areas. Weak negative correlations were seen between *depersonalization* and all areas of job-person fit and weak positive correlations with *personal accomplishment* and five of the six areas.

Organizations should attempt to reduce administrator workload so it does not lead to *emotional exhaustion* which could cascade into burnout. Special education administrator's values match could be a protective factor against burnout that should be leveraged. To best support students and teachers, districts must address administrator burnout: "We may be leaders, but we're also human. If we are truly interested in helping others, we have to help ourselves first" (Moss, 2021, p. 140).

Acknowledgement

I am grateful for the support I have had through this journey and feel fortunate for the privilege to continue my education. First, thank you to my committee members Dr. Frances Kayona, Dr. Steven Emerson, Dr. Amy Christensen, and Dr. Michele Barron-Albers. Your time, dedication and thoughtful feedback are appreciated. To Dr. Kayona, our meetings have been instrumental in keeping me on track and reminding me that my dissertation may not be "perfect", but it will be "done". I have thoroughly enjoyed learning from you, respect your authenticity and dedication to your work.

Thank you to the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) organization, especially Erin Toninato, Lori Zimmerman, and Taylor Ethen for their input, support and help distributing this survey. Thank you to my colleagues at Delano Public Schools, Meeker and Wright Special Education Cooperative and St. Cloud State University for encouragement. Thank you to my doctoral cohort. Busy lives kept us from connecting as often as we wanted but I always feel your support and value your friendship.

To my mom, Nita, who developed my love of reading and belief in myself. To my dad, Jack, who gave me and nurtured my inquisitive nature. To my stepmom Jodie, who taught me how to get things done and done well. Thank you to my friends, Doug, Sue, and Eric, for use of their wonderful cabin as a writing retreat. To my son Calvin, who keeps me on my toes and always striving to do my best. Love you, Cal! Most importantly, thank you to my husband, Tony. The resolute confidence you have in me and what I can accomplish has gotten me to this point. Your daily support and love are a reminder of what a wonderful partner you are and how incredibly lucky I am.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

List of Tables

Table Page

Table Page

Chapter 1: Introduction

"As a modern epidemic, burnout is the leading reason educators leave the profession" (Russell et al., 2020, p. 1). When educators burn out, it can lead to not only a shortage of qualified teachers but also poor-quality educational instruction, which negatively impacts students, educators, and society (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019; Wong et al., 2017). Based on trends in burnout research, pioneering burnout researcher Maslach and colleague Leiter (2005, 2011) have identified six domains of job environment that determine the degree of *job-person fit*. The researchers posit that the better matched the worker is with their job, the greater the likelihood of engagement and the reduced risk of burnout (Leiter, 2011). This study will examine Minnesota special education administrators' level of burnout and degree of job-person fit across the six domains of worklife. The data will be analyzed to look for potential trends in job match or mismatch with special education administrators and their educational organizations. Understanding areas most likely to be aligned or misaligned for special education administrators could assist with the creation of proactive strategies and supports to reduce their burnout. Reducing special education administrator burnout could lead to increased administrator support for special education teachers which may reduce teacher burnout and have downstream positive impacts for special education students.

Background of the Study

Quality teaching is essential for student learning (Kyriakides et al., 2013). Recruitment and retention of qualified teachers, however, has become increasingly difficult (Borman & Dowling, 2008). Teacher attrition has been a perpetual problem in education that has been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic (Dilberti & Schwartz, 2023). Most schools and students

experience the negative impacts of teacher turnover, but historically disadvantaged populations and schools in low-income areas have been impacted to an even greater degree by staffing shortages and teacher attrition (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019; DeMatthews et al., 2022). Students with disabilities are hurt further not only by teacher attrition and retention issues but also due to a shortage of qualified special education teachers: "A growing, and pervasive shortage of special education teachers threatens the quality of education students with disabilities receive" (Billingsly & Bettini, 2019, p. 697).

One factor that has been positively linked to teacher attrition is burnout. Burnout is an occupational phenomenon first studied in human service professions (Schaufeli et al., 2009). The World Health Organization (2019) defines burnout as:

> ...a syndrome conceptualized as resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed. It is characterized by three dimensions:
>
> - Feelings of energy depletion or exhaustion
> - Increased mental distance from one's job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one's job; and
> - Reduced professional efficacy.

Burnout has been associated with increased absenteeism, intentions to quit and turnover across professions (Madigan & Kim, 2021a; Maslach & Leiter, 2017; Russell et al., 2020). In human service professions, burnout is correlated with a, "...deterioration in the quality of care or services provided by the staff...low morale...and various self-reported indicators of personal dysfunction, including physical exhaustion, insomnia, increased use of alcohol and drugs, and marital and family problems" (Maslach et al., 2018, p. 13).

Teacher burnout is positively correlated with many negative outcomes for students, schools and the teachers themselves. (Herman et al., 2018; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach & Leiter, 2017). Teacher burnout is particularly impactful for children because teachers spend significant time educating students during their formative years (Genoud & Waroux, 2021). When a teacher experiences burnout, they are not only dissatisfied with their job, but they feel unable to engage in their work effectively (Madigan & Kim, 2021b). This feeling of inefficacy can lead to poor student academic outcomes, increased detachment, or indifference toward students, and decreased organizational commitment (Egyed, & Short, 2006; Hakanen et al., 2006; Herman et al., 2018). In addition to the impact on students, burnout can lead to negative outcomes for teachers' mental as well as physical health and can lead to decreased job satisfaction furthering the negative impact on students (Hakanen et al., 2006; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Maslach & Leiter, 2017, 2022).

Increased rates of burnout have been found in special education teachers (Hopman et al., 2018). Fore et al. (2002) attribute this increase to "...increasing paperwork loads, stress associated with the job requirements, a lack of planning time, lack of support from administrators, lack of proper staff development training, as well as the type of disabilities teachers deal with in the classroom" (p. 39). Hopman et al. (2018) note that burnout rates are increased for special education teachers working with many students with emotional or behavioral problems.

Ample research has investigated teacher burnout (Aloe et al., 2014; Brunsting et al., 2014; Park & Shin 2020; Pietarinen et al., 2013). This research often looks for individual and organizational factors that are correlated with burnout (Park & Shin, 2020; Shoji et al., 2016).

Individual teacher factors that have been studied include self-efficacy (Zee & Koomen 2016), personality (Genoud & Waroux, 2021; Herman et al., 2018; Maslach & Leiter, 2017) and emotional regulation (Alessandri et al., 2018; Pietarian et al., 2013). Organizational factors prevalent in the research include workload (Jiminez & Dunkl, 2017) and administrator support (Player et al., 2017; Slišković et al., 2019).

It has been suggested that supportive administrators aid in reducing teacher burnout (Player et al., 2017; Slišković et al., 2019). School administrators (i.e., superintendents, principals, special education administrators, and community education directors) have the potential to influence the working environment to improve teacher engagement and job satisfaction (Berry, 2012; Brunsting et al., 2014; Fore, 2002). Research has shown that competent, long-term principals appear to positively impact school stability and have been linked to decreased teacher attrition (Bartanen et al., 2019; DeMatthews et al., 2022; Player et al., 2017).

The job of a principal is varied and demanding (DeMatthews et al., 2021). Principals must ensure the school is operating efficiently, that all students are safe and academically successful, and provide supervision and support to many different employees (e.g., general education teachers, special education teachers, related service providers, paraprofessionals, custodial staff, administrative assistants, etc.). Supervising individuals in varied roles requires collaboration and assistance from other administrators. When working with special education teachers, principals may rely on special education administrators to provide counsel and assistance. The principal of the building is generally the direct supervisor of special education staff, but the special education administrator often provides additional support for these

individuals (Carter, 2011). In Billingsley and Bettini's (2019) literature review of special education teacher attrition and retention, they found that special education teachers had increased retention when they had positive perceptions of administrator support. Similarly, in a study of special education teachers in rural districts, special education administrator support was shown to improve special education teacher job satisfaction (Berry, 2012).

The special education administrator role can vary across districts. All special education administrator positions require advocating for special education students and supporting special education staff. Special education administrators have a host of other responsibilities including development of special education programming, due process monitoring and training, teacher evaluation, budget management, facilitation of collaborative meetings, and more (Carter, 2011).

Despite the importance and demand of the special education administrator position, few studies have examined their burnout nor the implications it may have for student outcomes or special education teacher burnout and attrition (Carter, 2011). Burnout likely affects administrators in the same way as teachers, but there are additional unique challenges of the administrator role that need to be examined to find solutions (Robinson, 2022). Special education administrators have the responsibility to advocate and support special education teachers and students with disabilities, but the support they receive is often limited (Ferris & Ruff, 2011). Ferris and Ruff (2011) highlight that supporting many staff and students, role ambiguity, pressure and demand from competing groups, and litigious climate are some of the stressors that may contribute to special education administrator burnout. Research on special education administrator burnout is needed to help the administrators themselves and to ensure they can provide the support staff and students need.

Theoretical Framework

A theoretical framework describes a rationale for a phenomena or problem and creates a construct that can be tested through subsequent research (Lynham, 2002). Grounding a research study in a relevant and thoughtful theoretical framework is of critical importance and helps inform the reader of how concepts are connected (Heale & Noble, 2019). The theoretical framework also details how the research fits with preexisting literature and guides the development of research questions and research methods for the study (Heale & Noble, 2019).

Burnout literature reveals several possible theories regarding the development of burnout. Simplistically, theories can be broken into sequential stage models or job stress and imbalance models (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). In the 1970s, sequential theories such as the phase model and the transactional model were proposed. Sequential theories assume that one component of burnout is the trigger for development of the other components (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). In the 1980s and 1990s, job stress and imbalance theories emerged including the Cherniss transaction model, conservation of resources model, job demands-resources model (JD-R) and the areas of worklife model of burnout (AW). These models focus on job stress and the degree of fit between the person and their situation, i.e., job-person fit (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). More recently, burnout is being examined not in isolation but as a continuum of employee wellbeing ranging from *burnout* to *engagement* (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Maslach and colleagues (2012) explain that this continuum ranges from: "...the negative experience of burnout (exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy) to the positive experience of engagement (energy, involvement, and efficacy)" (pp. 296-297).

The theoretical framework that will guide this study is a job imbalance model called the areas of worklife (AW) model. The AW model is one of the more comprehensive theories that allows for an inclusive review of the many workplace factors that impact job-person fit and the development of burnout (Leiter & Maslach, 1999). This model was developed by Leiter and Maslach (2011) after extensive review of the existing burnout literature. Their review led to the identification of six organizational areas that, when misaligned, may contribute to the development of burnout. The AW model views job stresses as mismatches or imbalance in one or more of the six areas of worklife (i.e., workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values) (Maslach & Leiter, 2017).

Table 1 provides an overview of the six areas that could pose a potential mismatch and contribute to the development of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Table 1

Six Areas of Worklife Mismatch

Areas of Mismatch	Description of Mismatch
Work Overload	Too many tasks or tasks that are not a match for the person's expertise or interest
Lack of Control	Lack of autonomy
Insufficient Rewards	Lack of recognition and/or pay or benefits that are too low
Breakdown of Community	Lack of social support and/or uncivil or hostile interactions with co-workers or supervisors
Absence of Fairness	Favoritism or bias (implicit or explicit)
Value Conflicts	Conflict between person's individual values and the organizations' values or an organization acting outside of their stated values

Note. Adapted from The Burnout Challenge Managing People's Relationships with their Jobs (pp. 85-156), by Maslach & Leiter, 2022, Harvard University Press.

Maslach and Leiter (2022) also look at the conceptual opposite of burnout, which is *engagement.* They explain that when there is alignment across the six areas of worklife, the employee will have a better *match* and will be more engaged with their work: "An ideal job-person match, therefore, would feature these six positive conditions: sustainable workload, ample choice and control, gratifying recognition and rewards, supportive work community, norms of fairness, respect and social justice and well-aligned values and meaningful work" (Maslach & Leiter, 2022, p. 74).

Prior research has identified teacher, student and organizational factors that can contribute to burnout (Park & Shin, 2020). While specific individual and organizational factors have been correlated with burnout, Maslach and Leiter (2022) maintain that because burnout is related to job-person mismatch, potential solutions should look at the worker and their degree of workplace fit when addressing burnout. The AW model focuses on six distinct areas of worklife that can impact how employees view their job-person fit. Despite the call to investigate job-person fit instead of specific individual or organization factors when studying burnout, little research has examined job-person fit in education for teachers or administrators (Player et al., 2017). This study will examine special education administrators' perception of their burnout with a focus on their job-person fit across the six areas of worklife.

Statement of the Problem

Educators have the highest rate of burnout when compared to all other professions in the United States (Marken & Agrawal, 2022). Burnout has been linked to increased turnover, attrition, and absenteeism which negatively impacts students (Genoud & Waroux, 2021; Madigan & Kim, 2021b; Russell et al., 2020; Shoji et al., 2016). Students with disabilities are at

an even greater risk for substandard education due to high rates of special education teacher attrition and an ever-increasing shortage of qualified special education teachers (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). An organizational protective factor associated with burnout reduction in teachers is administrator support (Player et al., 2017; Slišković et al., 2019) but little is known about principal burnout and even less about special education administrator burnout. For special education teachers and students to receive the support they need, it is necessary for research to examine and reduce special education administrator burnout: “When managers are exhausted and alienated, your organization’s vulnerability increases. Managers are responsible for burnout antidotes of engagement and wellbeing–so when they burn out, individual contributors can’t hope for much help” (Robinson, 2022, p. 2).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to extend the current literature on educator burnout by examining burnout through a job-person fit lens and surveying a population of educational professionals (i.e., special education administrators) that have received little attention in the research. This study aims to explore select Minnesota special education administrators' perceived level of burnout and their appraisal of their job-person fit in the six areas of worklife. These data will be analyzed to uncover any potential trends in job-match or mismatch with Minnesota special education administrators and their current worklife. It is hoped that a better understanding of the aggregate job-person fit in Minnesota special education administrators could lead to reduced administrator and teacher burnout, thereby improving education and care for special education students.

Research Questions

1. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their perceived level of burnout based on their self-rating across the following three scales: *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment*?
2. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their job-person fit based on their self-rating across the following six scales: workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values?
3. What is the association between Minnesota special education administrators' perceptions of their job-person fit across the six areas of worklife and their perceived level of burnout in the areas of *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment.*

Research Design

This quantitative study surveyed select Minnesota special education administrators. This study was a cross-sectional snapshot of special education administrators' perceptions of their burnout and worklife fit at one moment in time. The participants' interpretation of their burnout and what might be driving it was assessed based on their responses to demographic questions, one open-ended question, a slightly modified version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES) and the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS). There are 50 questions across the two surveys, all answered via a Likert rating scale. The MBI-ES asks participants to rate how often they experience each feeling on a 7-point scale. The questions correspond to the three different scales (i.e., *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization*, and *personal accomplishment*) (Maslach et al., 2018). The MBI-ES was modified to change the referent "*student"* to *"student*

or the educators that work in my district" to be more representative of the special education administrator position. The AWS has the participants rate their work environment on a five-point Likert scale in the areas of workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values (Leiter & Maslach, 2011). Analysis of participant's responses in both surveys, allows for a more thorough investigation of burnout: "The combined AWS/MBI is a particularly powerful tool for assessing the workplace context and what attributes might be driving burnout: e.g., workload, control, reward, etc." (Maslach et al., 2018, p. 3).

The survey results were analyzed through basic descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics allow for examination of the aggregate data to identify potential trends (Abbot & McKinney, 2012). Descriptive data are reported for each scale in the MBI-ES and the AWS. Statistical analysis included a measure of central tendency (mean), a measure of dispersion (standard deviation) and correlation coefficients. To maintain diagnostic validity, each of the scales were calculated separately and not combined: "Across all MBI versions, burnout is conceptualized as a continuous variable, ranging from low to moderate to high degrees of experienced feeling. It is not viewed as a dichotomous variable, which is either present or absent" (Maslach et al., 2018, p. 1). The data was also reviewed for variations across identified demographic groups (i.e., district type, administrator position type, years at organization, and years in administration). Additionally, the MBI and AWS data were reviewed to look for associations between special education administrators' perceived level of burnout and their job-person fit. Participants were given the option to respond to one open-ended question allowing the special education administrator to provide any additional comments or thoughts related to special education administrator burnout, engagement or job-person fit.

Assumptions of the Study

Assumptions are elements of the study that are assumed to be true but have not been explicitly tested (Roberts & Hyatt, 2019).

1. It is assumed that all participants will answer honestly.
2. It is assumed that participants' survey responses will be representative of their personal perception of their degree of burnout and their job-person fit.
3. It is assumed that the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) membership database accessed in October of 2023 will be representative of their active special education administrators and will contain current email addresses.

Delimitations of the Study

Delimitations are factors or decisions made by the researcher that focus the study and may impact the results or reduce the generalizability of the findings (Roberts & Hyatt, 2019). The following delimitations were identified to focus this study:

1. This study was conducted between October 2023 and November 2023. Survey responses from special education administrators in the fall may yield different perceptions of their organization and level of burnout than during the winter, spring, or summer related to different stressors present across a calendar year.
2. Participants in the study will be active Minnesota Special Education Administrators (MASE) members. Retired special education administrators, teachers pursuing administrative licensure and those in positions outside of special education administration will not be included in this study. Active members of MASE may have

different perceptions of burnout than special education administrators who are not members of MASE.

3. The study will utilize the Maslach Burnout Toolkit for Educators which will combine a modified version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory Educators Survey (MBI-ES) and the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) through a closed set assessment. This assessment provides information through rating scales that do not allow for open-ended responses, which could limit participants' ability to expand on specific questions. One open-ended question will, however, be added to the end of the questionnaire.
4. The MBI-ES has been used with school administrators in the past but was developed and normed originally for use with teachers. This could be considered a limitation as the questions are not specific to the special education administrator position (Ferris & Ruff, 2011). It should be noted however, that in response to this potential limitation, the wording of the MBI-ES will be slightly adjusted to be more inclusive of the special education administrator role.

Objectives of the Study

The study's objectives are a list of tasks that must be accomplished to complete the research.

1. Purchase of the license to administer the Maslach Burnout Toolkit which includes the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) and The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) for Educators from *Mind Garden* ©.

2. Obtain written permission from the executive director of the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) to access their membership list and to distribute surveys via email to current MASE members.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are operationally defined to help the reader understand their context in this study.

Areas of Worklife Model of Burnout. A theory that proposes that mismatches or job-person imbalance in areas of worklife (i.e., workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values) are the impetus for developing burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2017).

Burnout. The World Health Organization defines burnout as "...a syndrome conceptualized as resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed. It is characterized by three dimensions: feelings of energy depletion or exhaustion, increased mental distance from one's job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one's job; and reduced professional efficacy" (2019).

Emotional Exhaustion. Physical or mental energy depletion (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Depersonalization. Negativity or cynicism toward your job or the people you serve (Boujut et al., 2017; Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Personal Accomplishment. The belief that you can be successful in your job and with the individuals you work with (Boujut et al., 2017).

Job-Person Fit. Also described as job-person match, person-job fit, workfit and teacher-working environment fit is the degree that the employee's needs and resources match the demands and resources of the organization (Player et al., 2017).

Special Education Administrator. A *district leader* who works on behalf of students with disabilities (Ferris & Ruff, 2011). Position titles vary across districts. Most include *special education* or *special services* and then a subsequent title such as: executive director, director, supervisor, manager, or coordinator. Special education administrators often begin their career in special education teaching or in a related field and then obtain an advanced degree in administration (Carter, 2011). Special Education administrators perform a variety of tasks including staff supervision, special education program creation and evaluation, due process compliance, staff training, and collaboration and consultation with district staff, parents, and outside providers (Carter, 2011).

Teacher Self-Efficacy. *"*...individual teachers' beliefs in their own ability to plan, organize, and carry out activities that are required to attain given educational goals"(Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2009, p. 1059).

Work Engagement. "...a persistent, positive affective-motivational state of fulfillment that is characterized by the three components of vigor, dedication, and absorption" (Maslach & Leiter, 2017, p. 40)

Organization of the Study

This study will be organized in the standard five-chapter dissertation format with subsequent sections for references and appendices. Chapter 1 will introduce the study and provide the basis for the research. Chapter 2 will review the literature related to teacher and administrator burnout and the negative impacts it can have. Chapter 3 will describe the research methodology, design, and review the data collection and analysis procedures. Chapter 4 will

report the data and results from the study. Chapter 5 will summarize the study and findings and provide recommendations for further research and educational practice.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

A review of the related literature suggests that educator burnout has significant negative impacts for teachers, administrators, and students (Madigan & Kim, 2021b; Maslach & Leiter, 2017). Prolific burnout researchers Maslach and Leiter (2022) advocate for studying and addressing burnout by looking at job-person fit. The purpose of this research is to provide insight and uncover potential trends in Minnesota special education administrators' job attitudes and match across the six areas of worklife. A better understanding of special education administrator burnout could improve their engagement so they can provide effective support for special education teachers and students with disabilities.

This chapter begins with an overview of educator attrition and retention and the historical context and study of burnout. Burnout is then further explored through the Areas of Worklife Model (Maslach & Leiter, 1999) with explanations of the six potential job mismatches and burnout profiles (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). The impacts of teacher burnout on student achievement and wellbeing, and the impacts to the teachers are discussed. Existing literature related to individual and organizational correlates for teacher burnout are examined. Finally, an overview of the research on the administrator's roles in teacher burnout and retention is examined and the limited research on special education administrators' own burnout is reviewed.

Educator Attrition and Retention

Educator attrition and retention has been an important topic for decades because of the significant impact teachers have on youth and society. Findings from the Sixth American School District Panel Survey conducted by the RAND Corporation (2023) show that teacher turnover has increased 4 percentage points from before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic to 10% at the

close of the 2021-2022 school year with projections to reach 16% at the beginning of 2022-2023 school year (Dilberti & Schwartz, 2023). Special education teacher positions seem to be impacted to an even greater degree (Billingsly & Bettini, 2019). In addition, to the shortage of qualified special education teachers, districts have also seen increased attrition rates in special education teaching positions (Billingsly & Bettini, 2019). For administrator positions, their attrition rates are less studied but appear to be increasing as well (Dilberti & Shwartz, 2023; Lashley & Boscardin, 2003).

Special Education Teacher Attrition and Retention

In the Sixth American School District Panel Survey, district leaders were asked to report turnover rates across different educator positions (Dilberti & Schwartz, 2023). From their survey, substitute teachers and special education teachers were reported as the most difficult positions to fill with 78% and 53% of district leaders citing shortages in those positions, respectively (Dilberti & Schwartz, 2023). Losing special education teachers and having difficulty filling these positions, leaves the students most vulnerable to achievement gaps at risk: “Equitable opportunities for students with disabilities to learn are threatened, as special education teacher shortages and high teacher attrition rates persist” (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019, p. 736).

Providing quality special education services with insufficient staffing is more difficult due to an increase in students receiving special education services (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2022a). Except for a slight dip in the 2020-2021 school year, likely related to reduced enrollment during the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of students receiving special education services has increased each year since the 2011-2012 school year (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2022b). Billingsley and Bettini (2019) reviewed 30 studies from 2002 to

2017 to find what might be related to special education teacher attrition and retention. Their literature review found that the following factors were related to special education teacher retention: administrative support, collegial support, school culture, and the job demands. Consistent with previous research, they also found that special educators were more likely to leave school districts that have higher portions of students of color and those living in poverty, further impacting marginalized populations (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019).

Administrator Attrition and Retention

Many research studies have investigated teacher attrition and retention (Billingsly & Bettini, 2019; Goldhaber & Theobald, 2022; Madigan & Kim, 2021b). Some research has looked at how administrator support may correlate to teacher retention (Bartanen et al., 2019; Player et al., 2017). Few studies have investigated the degree and cause of administrator attrition despite how essential it is to retain quality school leadership for the success of a school (DeMatthews et al., 2022). Minnesota Rules, part 3512.0510, (State of Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes, 2020) lists four administrative positions that support Minnesota schools: superintendent, principal, special education director, and community education director. This review of literature focused primarily on the principal and special education administrator leadership positions. In Minnesota, both positions require administrator certification and include staff and student support, but their daily tasks vary. A special education administrator's work is focused on the creation, monitoring and success of special education programs, staff and students. Special education administrators perform a variety of tasks including staff supervision, special education program creation and evaluation, due process compliance, staff training, and collaboration and consultation with district staff, parents, and outside providers (Carter, 2011). The specific

responsibilities, titles, and roles of special education administrators, however, differ greatly across states and within states (Lashley & Boscardin, 2003). Principals' roles tend to be more consistent across and within states. Principals are the direct supervisor of most employees in their building. Their job is to ensure the school operates efficiently and that all students are safe and academically successful.

Retaining effective principals is necessary for the functioning of a school: “High rates of principal turnover threaten school stability, school improvements that advance achievement and equity, and school working [sic] conditions that support effective teaching and meaningful relationships with communities and families” (DeMatthews et al., 2022, p. 76). Across the nation, however, 18% of principals leave their school annually (Bartanen et al., 2019). Principal turnover and its impacts on student achievement and teacher turnover were investigated using statewide data from Missouri and Tennessee by Bartanen and colleagues (2019). Their results showed that schools who experience principal turnover had lower retention of quality teachers and scored lower on math and reading tests (Bartanen et al., 2019). Player and colleagues (2017) investigated the correlation between teacher retention and principal leadership and job-person fit. In their research, they found that principal leadership was correlated with retention in the school district and job-person fit associated with staying in the profession. The researchers investigated whether other personal or organizational factors contributed to retention and found that the correlation between principal leadership and job-person fit did not appear to be mediated by those factors (Player et al., 2017).

Despite the complexity of the principal position and their impact on school stability, student safety and teacher retention, DeMatthews et al. (2021) highlight that there has been little

recognition or investigation from the media, research field nor school districts on principal retention or attrition. The increased focus on teacher retention and attrition has not yielded the same attention for principals despite the significance of the increase:

> School principal turnover during the pandemic has received far less attention in the media than teacher turnover, yet it is among principals that we saw the largest turnover. Our nationally representative sample of district leaders estimated that 16 percent of their principals retired or resigned in 2021-2022, which is more than double the rate from 2020-2021. (Dilberti & Schwartz, 2023, p. 2)

Research in special education has highlighted the importance of special education administrators in retaining special education teachers (Luckner & Movahedazarhouligh, 2019). The existing literature has very little information on special education administrator's own attrition or retention. This could be related to difficulty quantifying the retention and attrition rates of special education administrators related to the differences in licensure requirements across states, the lack of defined national competencies of the position, and the variability in position title names (Lashley & Boscardin, 2003). Lashley and Boscardin (2003) posit however, that the sheer number of open and unfilled special education administrator positions indicate that whether related to increased attrition or other factors, there appears to be a significant shortage in special education administrators across the nation. There is also concern that the shortage of special education teachers will lead to a greater shortage in special education administrators in the future (Luckner & Movahedazarhouligh, 2019). Most information on special education administrators focused on the role they play in teacher retention not their own retention or

attrition rates. Comparatively, more information was found regarding the principal's influence on teacher retention than the special education administrator's influence on teacher retention.

Burnout

Burnout is an occupational phenomenon that was initially studied in human service professions and has now expanded to many sectors (Schaufeli, 2017). This occupational phenomenon exists on a spectrum ranging from burnout on one end of the continuum to work engagement on the other (Leiter & Maslach, 2005). Both burnout and work engagement are viewed as three-component constructs (Shoji et al, 2016). Burnout consists of *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment* (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). Engagement consists of high energy, involvement, and personal efficacy (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). Educators appear to be particularly prone to developing burnout (Shoji et al., 2016) which negatively impacts students and the educators themselves. In the sections that follow, the historical context and theories of burnout will be reviewed along with review of some of the studies conducted on burnout in educators (both teachers and administrators).

Historical Context of Burnout

"Burnout became an issue of interest over 35 years ago when, quite independently, a practitioner (Freudenberger) and a researcher (Maslach) began to write about this previously unrecognized phenomenon" (Maslach et al., 2012, p. 296). When Freudenberger began studying burnout in 1976, he viewed it primarily as a side effect of exhaustion in relation to excessive demands (Russell et al., 2020). Maslach's research on burnout started with human service professions in the 1970s and 1980s, by way of interviews and case studies (Schaufeli et al.,

2009). This research led to the recognition that while burnout included exhaustion, exhaustion alone was not synonymous with burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2017).

Based on the insights gathered from participant interviews, Maslach described burnout as a three-component construct that includes exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization (Maslach et al., 2012). In 1981, The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was created by Maslach and Jackson and included the three elements of burnout. A meta-analysis of research on job burnout completed by Shoji et al. (2016) showed support for the three-component conceptualization. The MBI general inventory has been revised four times since the initial development and additional MBI scales pertinent to specific populations (i.e., medical personnel, human service professionals, educators, and students) have been created (Maslach et al., 2012, Maslach & Leiter, 2022). The development and use of the MBI in research has garnered more credibility for the study of burnout (Schaufeli, 2017). In Schaufeli's (2017) article explaining the sociocultural history of burnout, he notes that while burnout may have been coined as a term in the United States in the 1970s, it is not a new phenomenon, and it has been present and referenced throughout history.

Research that has been conducted over the past 40 years indicates that burnout is experienced across many occupations and can result in significant negative impacts (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). That realization led the World Health Organization to acknowledge the construct and subsequently publish a definition that classified burnout as,

> ...a syndrome conceptualized as resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed. It is characterized by three dimensions: feelings of energy

> depletion or exhaustion, increased mental distance from one's job, or feelings of negativism or cynicism related to one's job; and reduced professional efficacy. (2019)

Maslach et al. (2021) extend the definition of burnout by including the opposite pole of engagement and explain that it is part of continuum ranging from, "...the negative experience of burnout (exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy) and the positive experience of engagement (energy, involvement, and efficacy)" (p. 296).

Once burnout research emerged in the United States, it quickly garnered interest and attention globally (Schaufeli et al., 2009). While significant research has been conducted on burnout internationally, the phenomenon is viewed differently across countries. Some countries view burnout as a social problem, whereas others view it as a medical condition to be diagnosed (Schaufeli et al., 2009). While the definition and classification of burnout is different across countries, the burnout construct continues to be a popular topic of discussion and research across the globe:

> The popularity of 'burnout' in North America can be explained by the fact that 'burnout' is a non-medical, socially accepted label that carries very little stigma. Paradoxically, the reverse seems to be true in some countries in Europe: burnout is very popular *because* it is an official medical diagnosis that opens the gates of the welfare state, with its compensation claims and treatment programmes [sic]. (Schaufeli, 2017, p. 124)

Cultural and linguistic differences also impact how burnout research is conducted across the world. Different languages assign different definitions to burnout. Some countries view burnout as an entire spectrum of symptoms whereas others view it as the end point or the most severe level of burnout (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Despite the cultural and linguistic differences, burnout

continues to be studied most frequently with one of the versions of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Schaufeli et al., 2009).

Models of Burnout

From the ample research conducted on individual and workplace correlates of burnout, multiple frameworks and theories have emerged (Leiter & Maslach, 1999). While there is not one accepted model of burnout, many of the frameworks have similarities. Most of the frameworks involve a sustained imbalance between the demands of the job and the resources available as well as a conflict or mismatch between the person and the job (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). The frameworks can be categorized as sequential stage models or job stress and imbalance models (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). Some sequential stage models are the Phase Model and Transactional Model. The job stress and imbalance models include models such as the Cherniss transaction model, the Conservation of Resources Model, the Job Demands-Resources Model, and the Areas of Worklife Model (AW Model) (Maslach & Leiter, 2017).

Areas of Worklife Model

One of the more inclusive job stress and imbalance models is the AW Model (Leiter & Maslach, 1999). This framework was initially created to categorize the research on burnout. Later that information was used to develop a framework for identifying work profiles and providing more specific directions for the management of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2005). The AW model views burnout as a mismatch between the person and the job and highlights that neither the worker nor the workplace are solely responsible for burnout: “The AW model proposes that the greater the perceived incongruity, or mismatch, between the person and the job,

the greater the likelihood of burnout; conversely, the greater the perceived congruity, the greater the likelihood of engagement with work" (Maslach & Leiter, 2017, pp. 43-44).

The AW Model allows researchers to look at the degree of job-person fit across six identified work areas: workload, control, rewards, community, fairness, and values (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). These six areas are distinct but often influence each other. Maslach and Leiter (2022) have grouped the six areas of worklife into "three essential dimensions" that can influence a person's relationship with their job. Viewing job-person match across the three dimensions illustrates how a mismatch in one area can influence and impact the other areas (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Table 2 explains the six areas of worklife that the AW Model is based on (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Table 2

Areas of Worklife

Areas of Worklife	Description
Workload	The amount of work based on the time and resources available, and whether the work aligns with how the employee wants to spend their time.
Control	The workers' ability to influence decisions, have choice in work and understand their role and place in the organization.
Reward	The degree the extrinsic (monetary and social) and intrinsic rewards match the employees' expectations.
Community	To what extent the employee feels safe, supported by supervisors and colleagues and their sense of belonging in the organization.
Fairness	The measure of equity, fairness and respect employees perceive in their workplace.
Values	How an employee's values match with the organization and work they are asked to do. Also involves the degree the organizations' stated values are practiced.

Note. Adapted from The Areas of Worklife Manual (pp. 4-9), by Maslach & Leiter, 2011, Mind Garden Inc.

Table 3 lists the three essential dimensions of a person's relationship with their job and the areas of job-person match that comprise them (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Table 3

Three Essential Dimensions of Job-Person Match

Three Essential Dimensions	Areas of Worklife in Each Dimension
The Capability Dimension	Workload
	Control
The Social Dimension	Reward
	Community
The Moral Dimension	Fairness
	Values

Note. Adapted from The Burnout Challenge Managing People's Relationships with their Jobs (pp. 26-31), by Maslach & Leiter, 2022, Harvard University Press.

When individuals match well with their work environment in the three essential dimensions, they have a good job-person fit and are more engaged in their work (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). Poor job-person fit can be seen when the individual does not match on the three essential dimensions and has a mismatch in one or more of the six areas (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). Pietarinen and associates (2013) also supported approaching burnout from a job-person match and stated that, "...teacher burnout is affected by the complex dynamic between the teacher and his or her working environment rather than a single personal or environmental attribute" (p. 63). They explain further that burnout is a social phenomenon that is context-dependent rather than one individual or situational characteristic (2013).

Table 1, as shown in Chapter 1, provides an overview of the six areas that could pose a potential mismatch and contribute to the development of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Table 1

Six Areas of Worklife Mismatch

Areas of Mismatch	Description of Mismatch
Work Overload	Too many tasks or tasks that are not a match for the person's expertise or interest
Lack of Control	Lack of autonomy
Insufficient Rewards	Lack of recognition and/or pay or benefits that are too low
Breakdown of Community	Lack of social support and/or uncivil or hostile interactions with co-workers or supervisors
Absence of Fairness	Favoritism or bias (implicit or explicit)
Value Conflicts	Conflict between person's individual values and the organization's values or an organization acting outside of their stated values

Note. Adapted from The Burnout Challenge Managing People's Relationships with their Jobs (pp. 85-156), by Maslach & Leiter, 2022, Harvard University Press.

When there is a mismatch in multiple areas of job-person fit, burnout is likely to follow (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). Maslach and Leiter (2022) emphasize that individuals should not be identified as either "burned out" or "engaged" but rather the information should elucidate the individual's fit across the six areas which could assist in developing potential solutions. Analysis of the recent research data on individual fit across the essential dimensions of work has identified five patterns of experience that people may exhibit (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Table 4 provides a brief description of each work profile and the approximate percentage of people who fell into that pattern in past research, as noted in Maslach and Leiter's 2022 book.

Table 4

Work Profiles

Work Profiles	Description of Profile	Percent Experiencing
Burnout	A significant mismatch in all six areas of worklife	10-15%
Disengaged	The individual is dissatisfied with the community, reward and control aspects of the job but is not experiencing exhaustion. Considered the most like burnout.	20%
Ineffective	They experience inefficacy in their job related to the type of work not being meaningful or conversely, because it matters deeply but they feel unsuccessful.	15-20%
Overextended	Experiencing exhaustion but no significant mismatch in the other areas	15-20%
Engagement	An engagement with work and match across all areas which allows people to have the capacity to do the work they find meaningful	33%

Note. Adapted from The Burnout Challenge Managing People's Relationships with their Jobs (pp. 53-58), by Maslach & Leiter, 2022. Harvard University Press.

Work profiles and information about job-person fit should not be used to place blame on the individual or the organization. Maslach and Leiter (2005) emphasize that the burden of addressing burnout should be shared:

> Burnout reflects an uneasy relationship between people and their work. Like relationship problems between two people, those between people and their work usually indicate a bad fit between the two, rather than just individual weaknesses, or just evil workplaces. And so reversing burnout requires focusing on both individuals and their organizations to bring them back into sync with each other. (p. 44)

When working to remediate burnout, significant attention should be focused on the job-person match so the organization and the employee can work collaboratively to address potential

mismatches (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). Maslach and Leiter (2022) assert that to improve worker's job-related attitudes, the solutions need to fit the organization. They recommend assessing both organizational and interpersonal solutions to burnout that are mutually agreed upon by the people in the organization (Maslach & Leiter, 2022).

Impacts of Burnout

Educators appear to be particularly prone to developing burnout (Shoji et al., 2016). Shoji et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analysis of 57 studies of professionals in education, healthcare and other fields and looked at the relationship between self-efficacy and burnout. The data showed larger effect sizes for teachers, as well as older individuals and those with more experience in their respective field (Shoji et al., 2016). Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2009) defined the components of burnout as they relate to educators. They stated that cynicism relates to beliefs and attitudes about students or colleagues and personal accomplishment to whether teachers feel what they are doing in the classroom is important. Knowing the high correlation between burnout and individuals in education, researchers have investigated how burnout impacts both teacher and administrator well-being, student well-being, and achievement.

Educator Impacts

Burnout can lead to negative health outcomes (both mental and physical), poor lifestyle choices, and negatively impacts job satisfaction in educators (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). Early work by Maslach and Jackson (1981) revealed that burnout led to,

> ...job turnover, absenteeism, and low morale. Furthermore, burnout seemed to be correlated with various self-reported indices of personal distress, including physical

> exhaustion, insomnia, increased use of alcohol and drugs, and marital and family problems. (p. 100)

Hakanen et al. (2006) also found that burnout symptoms were correlated with ill health and negatively related to organizational commitment.

Research has also investigated the impact burnout has on teacher retention and attrition. Russell et al., (2020) asserted that burnout is rampant among educators and is one of the primary reasons that teachers leave education. This 2020 study looked at the precursors to burnout and the relationship between job demands, job resources, turnover intention and work engagement. Turnover intention was used as a proxy for attrition data because it can be difficult to gather survey data from employees who have left the organization. The results showed that job demands, and turnover intention were positively correlated with burnout, but that job demands and resources, however, were not directly correlated with turnover intention (Russell et al., 2020). A meta-analysis conducted by Madigan and Kim (2021b) reviewed studies examining the relationship between burnout and intentions to quit, as well as job satisfaction and intentions to quit. Madigan and Kim found that all three components of burnout were positively correlated with intentions to quit and explained that when using the three-component definition of burnout, burnout accounted for more variability in teacher attrition than job satisfaction did. The authors posited that because burnout impacts all areas of a teacher's work-life, it is more strongly associated with intention to leave the profession than job satisfaction (Madigan & Kim, 2021b). Palma-Vasquez et al. (2022) underscored the negative impact of burnout on teacher turnover. They stated that turnover in teachers and the inability to replace teachers once they leave interrupts the learning process and results in negative financial impacts for the

school. Additionally, not filling positions can increase the work demands of the staff remaining, which can lead to increased burnout.

While most of the research on educator burnout has centered on teacher burnout, administrators also appear to be negatively impacted by burnout (Carter, 2011). Dilberti and Schwartz (2023) note an increase in principal attrition with nearly absent data on their work engagement, satisfaction, or burnout. Begley (1982) conducted a study surveying special education administrators in Illinois about burnout. She noted that behavioral changes can coincide with the development of burnout: "One may become noticeably less verbal at meetings, withdrawn, show symptoms of rigidity and be exceptionally short tempered" (Begley, 1982, p. 20). These behavioral changes negatively impact the special education administrator but also have the potential to limit the support they can provide special education teachers and the progress of special education students.

Student Impacts

While there has been ample research on the impacts of teacher burnout on the teachers themselves, there have been comparatively fewer studies looking at the potential impact for students (Arens & Morin, 2016). Madigan and Kim (2021a) completed the first systematic review of how teacher burnout may impact student outcomes. Their literature review found 14 articles that met inclusion criteria for the study. They noted a lack in longitudinal research and explained that many studies assessed only *emotional exhaustion* rather than all three components of burnout, which could negatively impact generalizability of results (Madigan & Kim, 2021a). Overall, they found some evidence that showed poorer academic achievement and reduced student motivation when teachers were experiencing burnout (Madigan & Kim, 2021a). The

authors hypothesize that the poorer academic achievement could be related to teachers feeling too burned out to adequately prepare for lessons, thereby delivering less effective instruction. The review of literature did not, however, find evidence to support a direct association with teacher burnout and student well-being. The authors questioned whether prolonged exposure to teachers experiencing burnout could lead to student stress and eventual student burnout (Madigan & Kim, 2021a). Madigan and Kim (2021a) encouraged more research on potential impacts of teacher burnout on students.

Arens and Morin (2016) looked at how *emotional exhaustion* impacted cognitive (i.e., achievement) and non-cognitive student outcomes (i.e., competence self-perceptions, perceptions of teacher support, and school satisfaction) in fourth grade German students. The study revealed that the classrooms with teachers exhibiting high levels of *emotional exhaustion* often had lower standardized test scores. They found less of a negative effect of burnout on student grades, which they attribute in part to the subjective nature of teacher grading (Arens & Morin, 2016). Outside of academic achievement, teacher's level of *emotional exhaustion* appeared to be negatively correlated with students' perceptions of teacher support and their level of school satisfaction but did not appear negatively associated with the student's self-concept (Arens & Morin, 2016).

Herman and colleagues (2018) investigated teacher burnout (along with stress, coping, and efficacy) in teachers working with kindergarten through fourth grade students in nine urban, midwestern school districts. From the data, they created four distinct teacher profiles. The researchers found that teachers in the, "...high stress, high burnout, low coping class were associated with the poorest student outcomes" (Herman et al., 2018, p. 90). More specifically, they noted that the high stress, high burnout, and low coping profile was positively associated

with higher disruptive behaviors and lower math achievement and adaptive skills (Herman et al., 2018). Field (2019) conducted a study looking at the association between teacher burnout and student outcomes with specific attention to student well-being and academic self-concept. She found that two of the three burnout elements (i.e., depersonalization and personal accomplishment) significantly predicted physical wellbeing but did not predict psychological wellbeing nor academic self-concept. The author suggests that it is possible that the wording of the assessment, reading levels of the children and their ability to accurately identify their psychological well-being could be reasons that the correlation was seen with the more concrete construct of physical wellbeing as opposed to psychological wellbeing (Field, 2019). Field (2019) also hypothesized that an impact of burnout on academic achievement may have been observed if the study had looked at objective educational achievement rather than academic self-concept.

Egyed and Short (2006) completed a study looking specifically at how teacher burnout (along with efficacy, experience, and preparation) might relate to special education referrals based on their interpretation of a fictional short story of a student with behavioral problems. The researchers found that teacher burnout was the only factor that impacted the decision to refer for special education. Of note, they found that it did not increase the referral rates but rather made the teacher more likely to be uncertain of whether to refer. They speculated that this could be related to the teacher's apathy toward the students and/or lack of energy to attempt to implement interventions (Egyed & Short, 2018).

Wong et al., (2017) also looked at how teacher burnout may impact special education students. The researchers conducted two randomized control trials looking at teachers in

Kentucky and their students with autism spectrum disorder (ASD). The students and teachers in the trial were either assigned to a control group or an experimental group receiving a consultative intervention called the *collaborative model for promoting competence and success* (Wong et al., 2017). When looking at the three components of burnout they found direct effects for personal accomplishment and indirect effects for *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalization*. Personal accomplishment was significantly positively correlated to Individualized Education Plan (IEP) goal progress. *Emotional exhaustion* was indirectly related to poor IEP outcomes by way of less student engagement. Depersonalization was related to IEP outcomes through an indirect effect from level of student engagement and teaching quality (Wong et al., 2017). The authors hypothesize that when teachers experience burnout, they may not have the resources they need to teach and may feel that either their job is not impactful or that they are ineffective (Wong et al., 2017). These feeling may lead to poorer instruction and reduced academic outcomes for special education students: "…such teachers may lose the ability to manage student learning and make good decisions with regard to student progress on IEP goals" (Wong et al., 2017, p. 422).

Workplace and Individual Correlates of Burnout

The negative impact that educator burnout has on students and the educators themselves has led researchers to search for individual and workplace factors that correlate with burnout. There are many different factors correlated with burnout. The review of related literature will explore select workplace and individual attributes found frequently in the literature. The selected workplace attributes are workload and administrator support. The identified individual attributes are self-efficacy, personality, and emotional regulation.

Workplace Attributes

Existing burnout research has identified organizational or workplace factors that can influence the development of burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 2017). Many features of the workplace have been studied in relation to burnout. The review of relevant research for this study will focus on workload (Jiminez & Dunkl, 2017) and administrator support (Player et al., 2017; Slišković et al., 2019).

Workload

It is not only the number of hours worked that contribute to burnout but also how the employee perceives their workload:

> Gallup's employee burnout statistics show that the number of hours people work each week does matter, with burnout risk increasing significantly when employees exceed 50 hours and climbing even higher after 60 hours. But how people experience their workload has a stronger influence on burnout than the hours worked. (Wigert, 2020, p. 3)

A study of Austrian workers looked at how workplace resources and workplace stressors impact worker's level of burnout (Jiminez & Dunkl, 2017). Their results indicated that high workload predicted *emotional exhaustion*. They also explained that in the short-term, workplace resources appeared to protect against burnout, but that additional longitudinal research would be needed to fully understand the relationship. In their study, they highlighted the importance of assessing both workplace stressors as well as resources when attempting to reduce job burnout (Jiminez & Dunkl, 2017). Jarzynkowski et al. (2021) in a study using the Areas of Worklife Scale on operating nurses and doctors in Poland, found a similar correlation between high workload and *emotional exhaustion*.

Russel and colleagues (2020) completed a survey of 855 educators teaching kindergarten through college across the United States. They found that the perceived job demands and workload are positively correlated with burnout. They emphasized that leaders should decrease job demands and increase job resources to reduce educator burnout and allow for quality education and instruction (Russel et al., 2020). Miller and colleagues (1999) looked specifically at special education teacher's intentions to leave special education or switch schools. They highlighted the negative impact that increased workload has on special educators:

> High student caseloads combined with the challenges of managing the diverse learning and behavioral needs of students with disabilities, completing excessive paperwork, and working with insufficient resources may cause many special education teachers to feel overloaded, stressed, and ineffective in their relationships with students. (Miller et al., 1999, p. 204)

In the preliminary limited research that has been conducted, high workload appears to be a factor in special education administrator burnout as well (Begley, 1982 & Luckner & Movahedazarhouligh, 2019). Begley (1982) surveyed Illinois special education administrators using the Maslach Burnout Inventory. While the authors of the MBI do not recommend labeling individuals dichotomously as either "burned out" or "not burned out", in this study, participants who scored below average on personal accomplishment and above the mean for depersonalization and *emotional exhaustion* were considered "burned out". They identified 5.65% of the sample as burned out. Assistant Directors had lower scores in *emotional exhaustion*, significantly less in depersonalization but also scored less on personal accomplishment. Those in the "other category" had the highest ratings for *emotional exhaustion*

and *depersonalization* but also the highest scores for personal accomplishment. *Emotional exhaustion* scores were highest for individuals working 7-10 years and those working 50-59 hours a week. The director group scored the lowest on personal accomplishment when compared to the other administrative positions (Begley, 1982).

The role, responsibilities and expectations of special education administrators has expanded greatly in recent years (Luckner & Movahedazarhouligh, 2019). Luckner and Movahedazarhouligh (2019) cite many reasons for the increase in job duties and pressure including: budget cuts, more frequent litigation, increased focus on student test scores, emphasis on ensuring special education teachers are using research-based instructional strategies and making data-based decisions, increased collaboration with parents and individuals inside and outside the school, new state and federal laws, and ever-expanding due process requirements. Luckner and Movahedazarhouligh (2019) conducted a study on special education administrators in Colorado. They emphasized that the role is ever-expanding and that special education administrators are challenged with work that is complex, and often have limited interaction with individuals in their same position: “They [special education administrators] routinely juggle multifaceted, difficult, time-consuming, and emotion-laden job demands, and when things get tough, they usually find themselves solving problems on their own” (Luckner & Movahedazarhouligh, 2019, p. 104). Hussey et al., (2019) conducted a study that explored the role, job satisfaction and working conditions of special education administrators in North Carolina. They called attention to the increasing demands of the special education administrator position related to more collaboration with general education and increased federal mandates. They explained that few studies have looked at the workload or satisfaction of special education

administrators but that they suspect that the high workload may impact how many people enter the field: “Risks and reductions in the number of individuals pursuing leadership positions may be related to demands of time, commitment, and expanding expectations, yet few studies have examined responsibilities, workload, or satisfaction of administrators in special education” (Hussey et al., 2019, p. 118).

Administrator Support

Administrator support has been positively correlated with teacher attrition and negatively correlated with burnout (Brunsting et al., 2014). Slišković et al. (2019) investigated how principal support impacted Croatian teacher’s degree of burnout and work engagement. Their study found that, “Teachers, who perceive higher levels of Principal support, also report about higher levels of joy, pride, love, vigor, dedication and absorption, as well as about lower levels of anger, fatigue, hopelessness, disengagement and exhaustion” (Slišković et al., 2019, p. 208).

For special education teacher burnout specifically, studies from 1979-2013 were examined by Brunsting and colleagues (2014). Four of the studies looked at the impact of supportive principals on special education teacher burnout. All four studies showed a negative correlation between administrator support and special education teacher burnout (Brunsting et al., 2014). The impact of administrator support for rural special education teachers was examined in select teachers across 33 states (Berry, 2012). The results showed increased job satisfaction, decreased burnout and decreased attrition for teachers who felt supported by special education staff, building administrators and special education directors (Berry, 2012).

Fore et al. (2002) also reviewed burnout and retention in special education teachers to provide a synthesis of the information to look for possible solutions to burnout. They reported

that lack of administrative support was positively correlated with burnout. Notably they found that special education teachers reported that they would be more likely to stay in their current position or return to a former position, if they received more support from an administrator (Fore et al., 2002). Miller et al. (1999) surveyed Florida special education teachers regarding their intention to stay in the special education field and their intention to stay at their current school. They found that administrator support, in addition to collegial and parent support, were factors in a special education teachers' decision to leave or remain in special education (Miller et al., 1999). The authors postulate that,

> When teachers perceive that they have the support to do their job, know what is expected of them, have opportunities to improve their skills, and feel empowered to make important decisions about their classrooms and programs, they may feel less overwhelmed by the significant challenges of teaching students with disabilities. (Miller et al., 1999, p. 204)

Gmelch and Gates (1998) conducted a study to identify individual and organizational factors that are correlated with administrator burnout. The study participants were principals and superintendents. The participants were surveyed using various questionnaires assessing their stress, burnout, social support, personality, and administrative role. Job ambiguity appeared to be most impactful to participant's reported levels of depersonalization and personal accomplishment. They also found that the degree of administrator supports the administrator receives may mitigate the negative impacts of role conflict and ambiguity (Gmelch & Gates, 1998). Hussey et al. (2019) surveyed special education administrators in North Carolina regarding their role, job satisfaction and working conditions. The survey consisted of one section

about their current work setting and a second section about their responsibilities and workload. They found that special education administrators noted that what they enjoyed about their position was seeing the positive outcomes for students and staff. The study found that the most impactful factors for special education administrators' retention were, "... support and engagement from school leadership, instructional practices, time available during the workday, and opportunities for their own professional development" (Hussey et al., 2019, p. 125).

Individual Attributes

There have been many studies on the impact of individual teacher factors on their level of burnout (Zee & Koomen, 2016). Some of teacher characteristics that have received significant attention are self-efficacy (Zee & Koomen 2016), personality (Genoud & Waroux, 2021; Herman et al., 2018; Maslach & Leiter, 2017) and emotional regulation (Alessandri et al., 2018; Pietarian et al., 2013). In review of the literature, a significant portion of the research assessing individual factors has been dedicated to understanding the correlation between teacher self-efficacy and burnout (Zee & Koomen, 2016).

Teacher Self-Efficacy

The degree to which a person feels they can influence a situation to obtain a specified result is self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Bandura was a prolific researcher and the founder of Social Cognitive Theory. Bandura viewed self-efficacy through the lens of Social Cognitive Theory explaining that while individuals are impacted by their social environments, they are also capable of influencing them by way of their own thoughts and actions (Bandura, 1997). It is this influence, or human agency, that leads individuals to act or to remain stagnant (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008). If a person does not believe they can positively influence a situation or

environment, it stands to reason that they would not elect to initiate or sustain effort in the task (Tschannen-Moran & McMaster, 2009). Perceived self-efficacy beliefs are of interest because they impact an individual's selection, motivation, persistence and success in various tasks (Schunk & Pajares, 2002). Though self-efficacy beliefs vary across different domains, tasks and environments, efficacious people are more apt to find and utilize opportunities whereas inefficacious people are less likely to persevere when they encounter barriers (Bandura, 1997; Boujut et al., 2017).

In research conducted from 1976 to 2014, perceived self-efficacy in teachers was negatively correlated with burnout (Brudnik, 2009; Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Yu et al., 2015; Zee & Koomen, 2016). Zee and Koomen (2016) synthesized the research for links between teacher self-efficacy and its impacts on teacher outcomes. They found that regardless of the participants' country they reside in or grade level they teach, teachers with high self-efficacy appear to suffer from less burnout (Zee & Koomen, 2016). Brudnik (2009) studied the degree to which general self-efficacy relates to Polish general education teachers' feelings of burnout. They found self-efficacy to be a protective factor in the *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalization* aspects of burnout. Yu and colleagues (2015) surveyed middle school teachers to look at the correlation between job stress and burnout, to determine whether self-efficacy played a part in the correlation. The study found that stress was positively associated with burnout and self-efficacy was negatively correlated to burnout (2015). Wang and colleagues (2015) found similar results in their study of Canadian teachers and concluded that teachers with higher self-efficacy report increased satisfaction with their jobs and decreased levels of burnout.

In a survey of Syrian and German teachers, Schwarzer and Hallum (2008) also found that teachers with high self-efficacy are less likely to experience burnout when compared to their peers with lower self-efficacy. After the initial phase of their study, the researchers looked longitudinally to determine whether self-efficacy measures from the year before predicted burnout. While there was some variation between age groups, they found that, "Self-efficacy appears to be a protective resource against job stress, whereas job stress translates directly into burnout" (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008, p. 166). In 2009, Skaalvik and Skaalvik also noted a correlation between self-efficacy and teacher burnout but explained that they believe the relationship to be reciprocal rather than unidirectional. Their findings aligned with another research study that indicated teacher self-efficacy (TSE) and burnout influence each other and that TSE may indirectly, rather than directly influence burnout (Lauermann and König, 2016; Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2009). A two-wave study of Italian military cadets also found that self-efficacy beliefs, specifically in managing emotions, may offer protection against burnout (Alessandri et al., 2018). Additional indirect effects of self-efficacy and burnout were found in a survey of elementary and secondary school teachers that assessed the relationship between teacher's general pedagogical knowledge (GPK) and burnout, as well as their self-efficacy (both general and teacher-specific) and burnout (Lauermann & König, 2016). The authors found that increased GPK had a direct negative correlation with burnout and an indirect positive correlation with TSE (2016).

Other researchers have looked at the relationship between self-efficacy and burnout in teachers who work with students receiving special education services (Boujut et al., 2017; Weißenfels et al., 2021). Weißenfels and colleagues (2021) analyzed the number of special

education students with social emotional needs and the influence it had on German teacher's burnout and self-efficacy relationship. Their results indicated that all three elements of burnout were correlated with each other and that all three components were also negatively related to TSE (2021). Boujut et al. (2017) investigated the effect that perceived stress, coping strategies and self-efficacy had in the burnout levels of French teachers working with students with Autism Spectrum Disorder in their general education or special education classrooms. The results showed that:

> The lower teachers' feeling of self-efficacy, the more they implemented emotion-focused coping strategies, which predict higher burnout in all three of its dimensions. Moreover, the lower the teachers' feeling of self-efficacy, the more they perceive the stressful situation in question as a threat or loss, perceptions that generate more *emotional exhaustion.* (Boujut et al., 2017, p. 8)

Effective classroom management is a critical skill for teachers to possess (Mitchell et al., 2017) that has been studied as it relates to self-efficacy and job burnout (Zee & Kooman, 2016). Aloe and colleagues (2014) explain that "The goal of classroom management is to maintain a learning environment that allows for positive interaction, access to learning, and enhanced student achievement" (p. 105). When teachers are not successful with classroom management, it negatively impacts student participation and learning (Bozkus, 2021). Teachers who have not developed effective classroom management skills or those who work with a significant number of students displaying challenging behavior, are at risk for increased stress and burnout (Boujut et al., 2017). The impact that classroom management has on student and teacher outcomes has led researchers to look at classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE)

and its impact on teacher burnout and job satisfaction. Malinen and Savolainen (2016) defined classroom management self-efficacy (CMSE) as, "...teachers' individual beliefs in their capabilities to prevent and manage disruptive student behavior in their school and classroom" (p. 146).

In Zee and Koomen's (2016) meta-analysis of research on TSE and the relation to student outcomes and teacher well-being, 17 of the 165 articles specifically assessed CMSE. They found that while most studies were cross-sectional in nature, there did appear to be a correlation between CMSE and ability to manage difficult behaviors. Aloe and colleagues (2014) also completed a meta-analysis on TSE and reviewed 16 studies that looked at whether CMSE is a protective factor for teacher burnout. The studies selected for review measured all three dimensions of burnout and CMSE in currently practicing teachers. While causality could not be determined, the results from the studies showed a significant negative relationship between CMSE and burnout (Aloe et al., 2014).

While less common, there have been some longitudinal studies that have looked at CMSE (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000; Lazarides et al., 2020; Malinen & Savolainen, 2016; Zee et al., 2017). Malinen and Savolainen (2016) conducted a longitudinal study of Finnish lower secondary teachers that showed that CMSE appeared to positively impact job satisfaction and negatively impact burnout. The authors did caution however, that results may look different in countries that have more inequity and differences in educational experiences across their schools (Malinen & Savolainen, 2016). Brouwers and Tomic (2000) also conducted a longitudinal study of secondary teachers in the Netherlands that assessed the relationship between teacher's CMSE and their degree of burnout. The authors concluded that, "in educational settings perceived self-

efficacy in classroom management has a longitudinal effect on the depersonalization dimension of burnout and a synchronous effect on the personal accomplishment dimension" (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000, p. 250). The authors highlighted the importance of targeting perceived self-efficacy in classroom management when looking to find ways to combat teacher burnout (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000). The authors suspect that teachers with reduced CMSE are less likely to problem-solve or change their approach when faced with difficult to manage classrooms (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000, p. 249).

Studies have also been completed regarding CMSE as it relates to special education schools and special education referrals (Egyed, & Short, 2006; Hopman et al., 2018). A study of Dutch teachers in special education schools for students with psychiatric disabilities was conducted by Hopman and colleagues in 2018. The study looked at the development of *emotional exhaustion* symptoms across the school year related to disruptive behavior. They examined specifically the role that the teacher's relationships with the students and their self-efficacy played in the development of *emotional exhaustion*. Their results showed that if the classroom had minimal disruptive behaviors, teachers with high CMSE appeared to have decreased *emotional exhaustion* levels across time whereas teachers with high CMSE in classrooms with a significant amount of disruptive behavior, experienced increased *emotional exhaustion* (Hopman et al., 2018). The authors speculated that being too emotionally involved with a class of students with significantly disruptive behaviors led to increased burnout and they recommended a more balanced approach to emotional involvement (Hopman et al., 2018).

Egyed and Short (2006) had teachers rate their levels of burnout and participate in a hypothetical exercise where they reviewed stories about a student with difficult behaviors and

were then asked whether they would refer the child for a special education evaluation. The authors found that TSE and burnout were negatively correlated (Egyed, & Short, 2006). They attributed the inverse relationship to apathy from teachers unable to deal with the classroom's difficult demands. They also found that when teachers experienced burnout, they were less certain about when they should refer a child for a special education evaluation. Their research also indicated that additional training in classroom behavior management may decrease teacher burnout because of increased experience and behavior management skills (Egyed, & Short, 2006).

Weißenfels et al. (2021) surveyed German teachers and studied the relationship between students in special education with emotional needs and the role that self-efficacy played in teacher burnout. They found that all dimensions of burnout were reciprocally connected and related to teacher self-efficacy. The number of students with special education needs was related to depersonalization and *emotional exhaustion* but not to lack of personal accomplishment. The number of students with emotional needs, however, was significantly correlated with all three components of burnout (Weißenfels et al., 2021). It should be noted that Germany is new to inclusive education (2017 Inclusive Education Resolution), which may have impacted their results.

Personality and Emotional Regulation

Studies have investigated how other individual attributes such as personality, emotional regulation and coping ability may correlate to the level of burnout. In general, burnout appears to be higher "...among people who have low self-esteem, an external locus of control, low levels of hardiness, and a Type A behavior style" (Maslach & Leiter, 2017, pp. 48-49). Friedman and

Farber (1992) studied Israeli elementary teacher's confidence in their teaching ability and level of burnout. They found that teachers with low confidence in their teaching and low confidence in their classroom management skills were more likely to report burnout.

Herman and colleagues completed a study in 2018 that identified patterns in teacher stress, burnout, coping and self-efficacy and defined teacher profiles and their relation to student achievement and behavior. From the data, they identified four teacher profiles: high coping/low burnout, moderate coping and burnout, low coping/high burnout, and low stress, high coping, and low burnout. Fortunately, most teachers in the study (60%) fell into the high coping/low burnout category and did not have poor student outcomes associated with their classroom (Herman et al., 2018). The teachers in the high stress, high burnout, and low coping classes, however, were linked with the poorest academic and behavioral outcomes (Herman et al., 2018).

Pietarian et. al (2013) looked at how a teacher's ability to self-regulate, ability to co-regulate, perception of their work fit, and view of their work climate would impact their degree of burnout. They found that co-regulation correlated negatively with all three components of burnout and appeared to positively influence the teacher's work fit (Pietarian et al., 2013). They found that self-regulation correlated negatively with only the exhaustion component and appeared less effective as compared to co-regulation when addressing burnout (Pietarian et al., 2013). Their study posited that, "...a good fit cannot be achieved by merely adapting to the working environment, but rather by actively modifying the environment together with others" (Pietarian et al., 2013, p. 69).

Alessandri and colleagues (2018) developed a study testing whether a teacher's emotional regulation self-efficacy impacts their ability to manage negative emotions thereby

influencing emotional stability and burnout. Their research found that there is a reciprocal relationship between emotional self-efficacy beliefs and emotional stability. While emotional stability was not the direct cause of burnout, it was the most important personality factor influencing burnout:

> The relationship between workers' emotional stability and burnout, however, is not direct. Instead, workers' emotional stability seems to set the basis for their perceived ability to manage negative emotions, and this latter seems to ensure them a higher resistance to stress. It appears that emotional self-efficacy beliefs in managing negative emotions at work is the key mechanism that protects workers from developing burnout-related symptoms. (Alessandri et al., 2018, p. 841)

Genoud and Waroux (2021) completed a study that looked at how negative affectivity in teachers impacted the development of burnout. They found that participants responded to workplace demands and stressors differently. The researchers identified two differing paths in individuals experiencing burnout, one emotional and one cognitive (Genoud & Waroux, 2021). The cognitive path was often observed in teachers whose expectations did not match their level of professional accomplishment. The emotional track was observed when teachers felt overwhelmed by workplace demands (Genoud & Waroux, 2021). Their research identified four different negative affectivity profiles and underscored the notion that, "...the etiology of burnout is not the same in every teacher, since personality, but also personal background can explain individual differences" (Genoud & Waroux, 2021, p. 1). Begley (1982) conducted a study on burnout in special education administrators. In additional to the impact of excessive workloads she called attention to how an administrator's personality can also be a factor in burnout:

> Individuals who tend to engage in work dealing with helping people tend to be idealistic and highly motivated to improve conditions around them; however, they do not have a realistic sense of their own ability to create positive change. These individuals enter their occupations with high expectations of making the world better and soon become disillusioned. (Begley, 1982, p. 7)

Zhao et al., (2022) also studied individual teacher attributes to find what potential protective factor c*areer calling* had in the development of burnout. In the study, they defined career calling as:

> a transcendent calling that comes from the self and goes beyond, a way to live out a particular life role in a way that demonstrates or gains a sense of purpose or meaning, as well as other-oriented values and goals as a basic source of motivation. (Zhao et al., 2022, p. 2)

They found that educators who view teaching as a calling are often more engaged in their work (Zhao et al., 2022).

Maslach Burnout Inventory

The MBI was first published in 1981 for various human services professions (Maslach et al., 2018). Over the years, different versions of the MBI have been published that focus on specific populations. There are now five versions of the MBI. Formerly called the MBI-Form Ed., the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES) is the most current educator version of the survey. The MBI-ES was created for, "...use with educators, including teachers, administrators, other staff members, and volunteers working in any educational setting" (Maslach et al., 2018, p. 2). The MBI-ES contains the same questions utilized in the MBI-Human

Services Survey (MBI-HSS) apart from the use of "*student*" in questions instead of the label "*recipient*" (Wheeler et al., 2011). The MBI-ES contains 22 questions across three scales (i.e., *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization*, and *personal accomplishment* (Maslach et al., 2018). The *emotional exhaustion (EE)* scale contains nine items, *depersonalization* includes five items, and *personal accomplishment (PA)* scale has eight items. Participants are asked to rate the frequency they experience each situation on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (daily). The assessment authors explain that the person administering the MBI should not be the supervisor of any respondents. Additionally, they state that that the survey should be conducted as a measure of "job-related attitudes" rather than specifically referencing burnout to reduce the impact existing connotations of burnout may have on the overall results (Maslach et al., 2018). The authors conceptualize burnout as a three-component construct. They emphasize that scores for each scale should be interpreted separately and not condensed into a single burnout score. They explain that the MBI results for participants can be combined to look for trends in each scale, tendencies across the sample or compared to normative data (Maslach et al., 2018).

Maslach Burnout Inventory Validity and Reliability

In the Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, Fourth Edition, the authors report that studies assessing the psychometric properties of the MBI-ES have, "…typically reported acceptable internal reliability estimates for the three MBI scales as originally designed, and numerous other studies have reported evidence supporting the construct validity of the MBI for educational settings…" (Maslach et al., 2018, p. 32). The authors cite a study by Iwanicki and Schwab supporting the need for three discrete scales to identify burnout except for two items on the

depersonalization scale. They reported Cronbach alpha estimates of .90 for the *emotional exhaustion* scale, .76 for *depersonalization*, and .76 for the *personal accomplishment* scale (Iwancki & Schwab as cited in Maslach et al., 2018, p. 32). Wheeler and colleagues (2011) completed a meta-analysis of the coefficient alpha estimates in published studies that used the MBI-HSS and the MBI-ES. Out of 221 studies initially identified for the study, 84 provided alpha coefficients and were included in the study. Overall, they found that the *emotional exhaustion* (EE) subscales yielded the largest coefficients with an average of .87. For the *depersonalization* (DP) scale and the *personal accomplishment* (PA) scales, lower alpha coefficients were found, with mean scale scores of .76 for both scales. The authors also looked for factors that were associated with a variation in alpha coefficients. They found that using a foreign translation of the MBI was associated with lower internal consistency for the EE and the DP scales (Wheeler et al., 2011). They noted that this could be related to language or translation concerns, cultural differences in how burnout is viewed, or both. They also separated data based on occupation and noted slightly higher alpha coefficients for the *personal accomplishment* scale in educators (.79) as compared to medical professionals (.76) and other professionals (.78) (Wheeler et al., 2011). Maslach and colleagues (2018) recommend that based on the slight variation in reliability based on profession, researchers report the internal reliability for their specific sample.

The factorial validity of the MBI was tested in teachers by Byrne (1993). She found support for the three-factor structure of burnout (i.e., *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization* and *personal accomplishment*) but observed that the model was a better fit with deletion of two test items (Byrne, 1993). The test items number 12 and 16 were noted as problematic across

teachers in elementary, intermediate and secondary schools related to, "…item 12, designed to measure PA, and item 16, designed to measure EE, cross-loaded substantially (>.20) on the EE and DP factors, respectively" (Byrne, 1993, p. 202). The researcher assessed the fit of the original model by removing items 12 and 16. They found that removing the two items significantly improved the fit (Byrne, 1993). Byrne (1993) noted that a 20-item assessment would improve factorial validity but that there were negligible differences in subscale reliability between the 20-item and 22-item survey. Despite the validity concerns with items 12 and 16, Byrne continues to advocate for the use of the MBI for burnout in educators:

> With the *caveat* that teacher responses to items 12 and 16 may not be valid indicators of perceived personal accomplishment and *emotional exhaustion*, respectively, clinicians can otherwise feel confident in using the MBI as a reliable and valid measure of burnout for pre-university educators. Furthermore, findings that the entire instrument (excluding items 12 and 16) was factorially invariant (with minor exceptions, as noted above) across teachers of three educational panels increases its value as an assessment instrument; psychometrically, this indicates that the instrument is eliciting responses to questions that are being perceived in the same way by different teacher groups. (Byre, 1993, p. 208-209)

The factorial validity of the MBI-GS, which was constructed similarly to the MBI-ES, was examined by Bakker and colleagues (2002). This study was a confirmatory factor analysis of the MBI across eight different occupational groups of Dutch employees. Results of the study showed unique factor loadings for each group but a consistent pattern to the structure: "The Three-Factor model fits the data for each of the eight groups equally well, suggesting that

exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy constitute three independent dimensions of burnout, independent of vocational aspects" (Bakker, et al., 2002, p.255). The authors found an overall goodness-of-fit ranging from .896 to .903 across all eight occupational groups (Bakker, et al., 2002).

The factor structure and construct validity of the Hungarian version of the MBI-ES was assessed by Szigeti and colleagues from a sample of 211 elementary and secondary teachers (2017). Their study did not find support for the three-factor model of burnout but instead supported measuring burnout with only two of the three MBI scales (i.e., *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalization*). They made this recommendation based on an analysis of the reported omega hierarchical coefficients of the three subscales. They explained that personal accomplishment had a coefficient of .50, "...denoting that its score is attributable partly to the specific underlying dimension and partly to the general burnout factor" (Szigeti et al., 2017, p. 536). It should be noted however, that participants were sampled based on convenience and the study used the Hungarian version of the assessment.

Areas of Worklife Survey

The Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) was constructed using information from several staff surveys conducted by the Center for Organizational Research & Development (Maslach & Leiter, 1997 cited in Leiter & Maslach, 2003). The AWS was created to complement the MBI by adding strength and breadth to the understanding of job-related attitudes (Maslach et al., 2018). In the AWS manual, Leiter and Maslach explain that their goal was,

> …to develop a measure that would apply the concept of job-person fit to the assessment of the six key areas of worklife, in a generic format that could be utilized easily by any

> type of worker. We chose to focus on the fit itself, rather than on the two component parts of person and of job, and thus asked respondents to rate their level of experienced congruence with the job in these six domains. (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011)

The AWS contains 28 items in the following six areas: *workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values* (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). The 28 items are split into: *workload* (four), *control* (four), *reward* (four), *community* (five), *fairness* (six), and *values* (four). Participants rate their agreement with statements about their relationship with their workplace on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). Each scale receives a score ranging from 1.00 (extreme mismatch) to 5.00 (extreme match). When scoring the measure, positively worded items utilize their numeric rating and negatively worded items are reversed (i.e., responses marked 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 are scored 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, respectively). When interpreting the data, each scale should maintain their separate score, as each measures a distinct area of worklife (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). Streiner and Kottner (2014) assert that when subscales are consequential, reporting one single cumulative score is contraindicated: "If the sub-scales are meaningful, then the entire scale should not be uni-dimensional [sic]…if the scale is uni-dimensional [sic], then the sub-scales are superfluous and do not provide useful information" (p. 1975). To improve the psychometric properties of the scale, the AWS was adjusted slightly in 2011 to include one additional question in the *control* scale and to delete one question in the *workload* scale and one in the *control* scale (Leiter & Maslach, 2011).

Areas of Worklife Survey Validity and Reliability

The Areas of Worklife Survey normative sample consists of 22,714 individuals in a variety of workplaces from Canada, United States of America, Italy, Spain, Finland, Germany, Mexico, Turkey and China. Most of the participants were hospital employees (N = 15,260) but there were also other types of employees, including teachers (N = 419) in the study (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). Descriptive statistical measures of central tendency and reliability were calculated for each subscale. The authors reported Cronbach Alpha measures for each subscale: workload (.666), control (.827), reward (.781), community (.803), fairness (.799), and values (.726) (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). The authors also assessed the correlation between the six areas of worklife as well as their associations with the MBI-GS and all correlations proved significant (i.e., $p < .0001$). Leiter and Maslach assert that these findings provide support for the AWS:

> The relationships between AWS and Exhaustion and Cynicism are clear, positive scores in AWS are negatively correlated with Exhaustion and Cynicism, but positively correlated with Efficacy. This quality demonstrates that the AWS describes both the demand and the resource side of employees' experience with their work environment. (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011, p. 15)

The test-retest reliability of the AWS was assessed across one year. All scales had similar moderate to moderately low correlation coefficients (.51 to .62), showing that the worklife factors appear to change at a similar rate in response to changes across the year in the work setting (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). The authors explain that the test-retest correlations would be expected to be high if the employees' job-person fit remains the same across the year.

The six areas of worklife were studied as potential predictors of burnout in Polish nurses and doctors who work in surgery (Jarzynkowski et al., 2021). They found that their sample experienced all three facets of burnout (i.e., *emotional exhaustion*, *depersonalization*, and *personal accomplishment*). Their study also showed that the six areas of worklife (workload, control, community, rewards, fairness, and values) are all predictors of occupational burnout in their participants (Jarzynkowski et al., 2021). Spinelli et al., (2016) also used the AWS in conjunction with the MBI to look at burnout in health care systems. They advocated for future research to use these two measures together to develop a true understanding of what is driving work engagement and burnout:

> Using the MBI and AWS together can highlight the relationship between system work experiences and burnout. If system effects on burnout are ignored, offering personal management strategies to health-care workers and then returning them to the same systems will likely result in recurrent burnout. (Spinelli et al., 2016, p. 294)

Summary

Chapter 2 provided an overview of literature related to burnout development, impacts of burnout on students, teachers and administrators and theories for addressing burnout. The literature review revealed that most of the burnout research in education focuses on either individual teacher factors or specific organization factors, but few that look at job-person fit. Additionally, there appears to be very few studies that look at the impact of burnout on principals or special education administrators. Chapter 3 will review the methodology of the study including the design, specifics about the sample population, survey instrumentation, and how the data was analyzed.

Limitations in Current Research

While the topic of burnout in educators has been studied, the focus has been on teacher burnout with little attention on administrator burnout. One of the organizational correlates that has been negatively associated with teacher burnout is administrator support (Player et al., 2017; Slišković et al., 2019). Principal leadership has been cited as instrumental for student success, teacher well-being and teacher retention, but minimal studies have addressed the level of burnout in principals nor how to support them (DeMatthew et al., 2021 & Player et al., 2017). Special education administrators have received even less attention, despite the important role that they play in supporting special education teachers who are at the greatest risk of burnout (Edmonson, 2001; Hussey et al., 2019; Park & Shin, 2020).

The limited preliminary research conducted with special education administrators has shown high levels of *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalization* (Carter, 2011; Ferris & Ruff, 2011). Additional studies, both cross-sectional and longitudinal in design, are needed to gain a better understanding of the prevalence and presentation of burnout in special education administrators. The few research studies that have studied special education administrator burnout often look at workload, role ambiguity or other specific individual or organization correlates rather than their job-person fit (Edmonson, 2001; Ferris & Ruff, 2011). To better understand special education administrator engagement and burnout, more studies are needed that look at all three components of burnout (i.e. *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization* and *personal accomplishment*). Additionally, these studies should pair assessments of burnout with questionnaires that address job-person fit so that potential trends and systemic solutions can be identified (Spinelli et al., 2016).

Chapter 3: Methodology

This study is designed to assess the perceived level of burnout and degree of job-person fit in Minnesota special education administrators. These perceptions will be obtained via self-reported scores from the Maslach Burnout Toolkit for Educators which includes a slightly modified version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES) and the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS). Demographic questions will be added to the questionnaire to allow for statistical comparison across groups of special education administrators. The results of each scale will be reported separately and analyzed via descriptive and correlation statistics.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to extend the current literature on educator burnout by examining burnout through a job-person fit lens and surveying a population of educational professionals (i.e., special education administrators) that have received little attention in the research. The study aims to explore select Minnesota special education administrators' perceived level of burnout and their appraisal of their job-person fit in the six areas of worklife. These data will be analyzed to uncover any potential trends in job-match or mismatch with Minnesota special education administrators and their current worklife. It is hoped that a better understanding of the aggregate job-person fit in Minnesota special education administrators could lead to reduced administrator and teacher burnout, thereby improving education and care for special education students.

Research Questions

1. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their perceived level of burnout based on their self-rating across the following three scales: *emotional exhaustion*, *depersonalization*, and *personal accomplishment*?

2. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their job-person fit based on their self-rating across the following six scales: workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values?
3. What is the association between Minnesota special education administrators' perceptions of their job-person fit across the six areas of worklife and their perceived level of burnout in the areas of *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization*, and *personal accomplishment?*

Research Design

This study will be a cross-sectional, quantitative study of select Minnesota special education administrators. This questionnaire will be conducted with a population of special education administrators who are active members of the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE). Administrators will be asked questions about their perceived level of burnout and job-person fit. The questions about burnout will be framed as "job-related attitudes" rather than "burnout" to reduce the impact that preconceived notions of burnout may have on the participant's responses. Special education administrator perceptions will be gathered from their responses to questions from the Maslach Burnout Toolkit for Educators, additional demographic questions and one open-ended question. The Maslach Burnout Toolkit for Educators includes the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES) and the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) questions, for 50 questions, all answered via a Likert rating scale.

Written permission will be obtained from the MASE executive director to access and use email addresses from the MASE membership list for online email distribution. Administration of the survey online will allow for a more geographically representative sample than an in-person

survey would allow (Schonlau et al., 2002). Conducting the survey online will allow for additional benefits such as: ease of administration, storage of survey data without risk of written transfer or transcription error, and ability to send personal reminders to those who have not completed the survey (Fulton, 2018). The study participants use email daily and are familiar with online survey instruments, making the online platform easy and convenient.

Participants

This study will use a criterion sampling technique to identify study participants. The study participants will be Minnesota special education administrators who are active members of the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) in the 2023-2024 school year and are currently working in a special education administrator role. The MASE active membership is available to any person,

> …who is licensed or employed as an administrator for special education or former administrator currently employed in another capacity serving children with disabilities. Active Membership includes the Director of Special Education of record, Assistant Directors of Special Education, Special Education Coordinators and other persons on administrative contract who oversee, direct, supervise or coordinate a program, school or classes for special education as a primary job responsibility. (MASE, n.d.)

Sampling Procedures

The MASE active membership list of approximately 550 members will be used as the sampling frame. Criterion sampling will be used to identify the study sample to ensure participants are actively working in special education administration. Based on self-reported position titles from the directory, participants with the following titles will be removed from the

sample: superintendent, principal, assistant principal, curriculum director, teacher, related service provider and student. Additionally, any retired members and the researcher will be omitted from the sample. All the remaining active members will be sent the survey. The first demographic question will ask about participant position. If an individual indicates they do not work in special education administration, their survey participation will be finished.

The primary concern with samples is whether they are representative of the larger group (Fulton, 2018). The Minnesota Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (PELSB) data reports were reviewed to assess whether PELSB data sets would be more representative of the target population of Minnesota special education administrators than the MASE active membership list. After reviewing various publicly available data reports, it was evident that sending surveys via these groupings could unintentionally lead to inclusion of participants not intended for the study (e.g., retired directors, licensed administrators who are not practicing, teachers on special assignment, etc.) and would omit those intended to be studied (e.g., special education administrators on an administrative contract but not the director of special education on record for the district).

Participants will be identified from the MASE membership list due to the geographic diversity, ability to identify then remove those not currently in administration roles, and the potential to include additional special education administrator positions beyond the director of record. While the MASE membership list does not include all Minnesota special education administrators, the sample contains administrators from across the state, those in various administrative positions and individuals in different types of districts (i.e., single district, cooperative, intermediate, and charter).

Recruitment

The researcher acknowledges the demanding schedule of special education administrators. To make survey completion less arduous, the researcher will attempt to create a concise, user-friendly survey. The survey will include Likert scale and multiple-choice questions and one open-ended question. The letter of modified consent will include a succinct, yet informative rational, to highlight the importance of the study.

Low response rates can reduce the validity of survey data: "...declining response rates among organizational studies threaten the quality of data being collected and the limited empirical attention given to assessing nonresponse bias undermines confidence in the data's external validity" (Fulton, 2018, p. 242). Prior to the study, as recommended by Fulton (2018), the researcher will seek input from experts in the field, who will not participate in the study, to assist with the study design and proactively identify strategies to encourage survey completion. The experts (i.e., MASE executive director, MASE director of professional learning and one region low-incidence facilitator) will be identified via a convenience sample due to their expertise, respect within the profession, and their ability to encourage survey completion from Minnesota special education administrators, if they chose to do so. The experts will be informally interviewed via Google Meet and in-person conversation for their thoughts regarding survey timeline, survey content, and response rate strategies. Additionally, the MASE executive director, MASE director of professional learning, and seven regional low-incidence facilitators will be asked to share a brief study recruitment video with their membership and/or professional contacts to encourage completion of the survey when they receive it. During the study, reminder emails will be sent three weeks after the initial survey is delivered, to individuals who have not

responded and those who have started but not completed their questionnaire. Two weeks after the reminder email has been sent, the survey will close.

Description of Study Sample

The MASE membership list will be used as the sampling frame. The list will be retrieved in October of 2023, at a time of year when historically, most members have renewed their membership. Based on self-reported position titles in the membership list, potential participants with the following titles will be removed: superintendent, principal, assistant principal, curriculum director, teacher, any related service provider, and student. Additionally, any retired members will also be omitted from the sample as will the researcher. All other members will be sent the survey. Each year, there are approximately 550 active MASE members. Approximately 85% of active members meet the inclusion criteria for the study and will be sent the survey.

Instrumentation

The instruments that will be used in this study are from the Maslach Burnout Toolkit for Educators. The Maslach Burnout Toolkit for Educators includes the Maslach Burnout Inventory Educator Survey (MBI-ES) and the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) 5th Edition (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011; Maslach, 1986). Questions from the MBI-ES will be adjusted slightly to align with the special education administrator role more closely. The AWS questions will be administered as written in the 5th edition of the survey. Four demographic questions will be obtained via self-report in the same survey to look for tendencies across specific special education administrator types. Three of the four demographic questions will be adapted from the optional AWS demographic questions and one additional question created by the researcher will be added. Questions will include information regarding district type, position type, years in

special education administration and years in current organization. The survey will conclude with one open-ended question asking for any additional comments or thoughts related to special education administrator burnout, engagement or job-person fit that participants would like to share.

A "Remote Online Survey License: AWS + MBI" will be purchased from *Mind Garden* ©. Purchase of the license will allow for administration and scoring of both surveys up to the quantity purchased. Permission to use these instruments allows the researcher to administer both surveys in their entirety. This permission, however, does not allow the researcher to include the full instrument in the final dissertation. To adhere to the purchase agreement, three sample questions from the MBI-ES and six sample questions from the AWS will be included in the write-up. To comply with the conditions of use, each time a unique participant opens the survey will be considered one administration but only completed surveys will be included in the sample. An individualized login will be assigned to each participant to limit access to identified participants only.

Maslach Burnout Inventory Overview and Adjustments

The MBI-ES contains 22 questions across three scales (i.e., *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment* (Maslach et al., 2018). The *emotional exhaustion (EE)* scale contains nine items, *depersonalization* includes five items, and *personal accomplishment (PA)* has eight items. Participants will be asked to rate the frequency they experience each situation on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (daily). The MBI-ES will be modified slightly to be more relevant for special education administrators. Questions that include the referent "*student"* will be expanded to state, "*students or the*

educators that work in my district". This adjustment will be made to allow respondents to provide insights on burnout that could be related to interaction with educators because their role includes considerably more staff support and interaction than direct student contact.

Areas of Worklife Survey Overview

The AWS contains 28 items in the following six areas: *workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values* (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). The 28 items are split into: *workload* (4), *control* (4), *reward* (4), *community* (5), *fairness* (6), and *values* (3). Participants rate their agreement with statements about their relationship with their workplace on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). The AWS, except the optional demographic questions, will be administered without modification because they are relevant for special education administrators.

Psychometric Properties of the Scales

Questionnaires used in research must have strong psychometric properties. When a survey consistently measures the construct it proclaims, with minimal error, the researcher can have more confidence in the results of the scale. It is important to note however, that a measure cannot be deemed reliable or valid in all conditions: "…reliability and validity are not fixed properties of a scale, but depend on an interaction among it, the population being evaluated and the circumstances under which the instrument is administered" (Streiner & Kottner, 2014, p. 1970). When looking at reliability, Wheeler and colleagues (2011) contend that "Reliability coefficients of at least .70 are recommended for early stages of research, .80 in an applied setting when cutoff scores are used, .90 in applied settings if important decisions are being made…" (p. 241).

Maslach Burnout Inventory Validity and Reliability

The MBI is considered by many researchers to be the gold standard in burnout research (Schaufeli et al., 2009). The three-factor conceptualization of burnout has been supported through construct validity testing in education and other professions (Bakker, et al., 2002; Bryne, 1993; Iwancki & Schwab, 1981). Many researchers have completed Cronbach Alpha tests of reliability on the MBI. Wheeler and colleagues (2011) completed a meta-analysis of Cronbach Alpha scores and estimates of .76 - .90 were reported for the three MBI scales across the 84 studies. Many factors can impact the validity and reliability of a measure such as: connotation of the construct in the geographic area, the language the assessment is being administered in, the composition of the sample of participants and more. Due to this, Maslach and Leiter recommend computing internal reliability for each specific sample (Maslach et al., 2018). Reliability coefficients of the MBI-ES for special education administrators were not found in the current literature. To determine the reliability of the MBI-ES for special education administrators, a Cronbach alpha test of reliability will be conducted for this specific sample.

Areas of Worklife Survey Validity and Reliability

The AWS was normed across a large sample (22,714) of individuals across a variety of countries and work settings. The authors reported Cronbach Alpha measures for each subscale: workload (.666), control (.827), reward (.781), community (.803), fairness (.799), and values (.726) (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). The authors also assessed the correlation between the six areas of worklife as well as their associations with the MBI-GS and all correlations proved significant (i.e., $p < .0001$). This study will compute a Cronbach alpha test of reliability to report the statistical integrity of the AWS used with the sample population in this study.

Data Collection Procedures

Data collection procedures will be approved by the St. Cloud State Institutional Review Board (IRB) before the study is conducted to ensure that informed consent and confidentiality procedures are followed. The data will be collected during a four-week period from October 16, 2023, to November 21, 2023. Before data collection starts, the researcher will contact the Executive Director of MASE to obtain permission to use the MASE membership list. Minnesota regional low incident facilitators and the MASE executive director will be sent a short study recruitment video detailing the purpose and rationale of the study and a request to share it with their membership and colleagues. The study recruitment video will explain the purpose of the study, the researcher's attempts to make the survey concise and informative, and a request for their participation. The identified special education administrators will be contacted via email. The email will be sent by the MASE organization and will inform members that it is being sent on the researcher's behalf. The email will include the informed consent, explanation that participation is voluntary, and assurance that their information will remain confidential. The survey will be sent to participants using the Qualtrics platform. This platform will allow each participant to access the survey by a personal link. Reminder emails will be sent approximately three weeks after the initial survey is delivered, to individuals who have not responded or have started but not completed the questionnaire.

Data Organization

The survey result data will be presented in table format. Participant's responses to the four demographic questions will be reported in the first tables. The next tables will list the MBI-ES results including: the number of respondents, measure of central tendency (mean) and

measures of dispersion (standard deviation) for each of the three MBI-ES scales. The AWS data will be reported in the same way, with mean and standard deviation reported for the six areas of work life in the AWS. The data will then be disaggregated based on demographic group (i.e., administrator position type, organization type, years at organization, and years in administration) for both the MBI-ES and AWS. Correlations between the MBI-ES scales and the AWS scales will be presented. Responses to the open-ended question will be reported in table and narrative format.

Data Analysis

The self-reported information from the questionnaire will be analyzed through descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics allow researchers to, "...boil down the essence of a set of information so that it can be understood more readily and from different vantage points" (Abbott & McKinney, 2013, p. 364). Descriptive statistics will be calculated for each of the three MBI-ES and the six AWS scales. To maintain the three-factor construct of burnout, each of the three MBI scales will be analyzed separately. Their mean and standard deviation will be reported. Similarly, the six subscales of the AWS will be analyzed independently, rather than listing an overall survey score, with the same descriptive statistics reported. Demographic data will be obtained via embedded questions in the online survey. The data from the scales will be disaggregated and reviewed based on the following demographic questions: position type, type of school district, years in administration, and years at district. The data from the burnout section and the areas of work life section in the questionnaire will be examined using a Pearson Correlation Coefficient, to assess the degree of association between the scales. Trends or commonalities from the one open-ended feedback question will also be reported.

Data Protection and Security

This study will adhere to all IRB regulations. Survey data will be housed in a password protected account in Qualtrics on a password protected computer. Results will not be shared until the study ends. Each participant will receive a unique questionnaire link. Participants in the study will be assured that their name, identifying information, and survey responses will remain confidential and will be deleted after conclusion of the study. The results will share aggregate data and not indicate participant identity.

Chapter 4: Results

This study examines Minnesota special education administrators' perception of their degree of burnout and level of job-person fit in their current position. Results for this study were obtained using a questionnaire comprised of The Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES) (Maslach et al., 1986), The Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) (Leiter & Maslach, 2011), four demographic questions and one open-ended question. The MBI-ES asks participants to rate the frequency they experience job-related feelings from 0 (never experience) to 6 (experience every day). Questions on the MBI-ES assess the frequency the person feels emotionally exhausted, the amount of time they feel depersonalization, and the frequency they experience personal accomplishment. The AWS gathers information about job-person fit through a series of Likert questions from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The six categories of questions on the AWS are: *workload, control, reward, community, fairness,* and *values*. Table 5 describes the type of questions included in each of the six sections.

Table 5

Areas of Worklife Survey Scale Descriptions

Scale	Description
Workload	Amount of work compared to the time available in the workday
Control	Degree of professional autonomy and ability to influence the work and the environment
Reward	Amount of recognition and appreciation received
Community	Degree of trust, open communication, support and collaboration that exists between colleagues
Fairness	How fairly decisions are made, and resources are allocated
Values	How similar the organization values and goals are to the employees' values and goals

Results are presented in narrative and table format. First, the chapter provides an overview of the return rate for the study. Next, the Cronbach alpha test of reliability for the scales in each survey will be listed. Demographic information of the participants follows. Then, the combined mean and standard scores of all participants in the sample are reported for the three MBI-ES scales and the six AWS scales. The results are then disaggregated by the following demographic variables: position type, district type, years in special education administration and years in district. Finally, correlation coefficients of the MBI-ES and AWS scales are examined. The chapter is organized in order of the three research questions:

1. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their perceived level of burnout based on their self-rating across the following three scales: *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment*?
2. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their job-person fit based on their self-rating across the following six scales: workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values?
3. What is the association between Minnesota special education administrators' perceptions of their job-person fit across the six areas of worklife and their perceived level of burnout in the areas of *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment?*

Return Rate

Four hundred eighty active members of Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) were sent the “Special Education Administrator Job-Related Attitudes Questionnaire”. Of the 480 sent the survey, 10 potential participants removed themselves from the sample, by

indicating they are not currently working in special education administration. Of the 470 potential participants remaining, 198 completed the MBI-ES and AWS questions for a return rate of 42%. An additional 15 participants completed the MBI-ES but not all portions of the AWS. This increased the participation rate for the MBI-ES to 45% of the sample. Questionnaires that have complete MBI-ES ratings, but incomplete AWS responses, are included in the basic descriptive statistic tables but are not included in the correlation tables.

Cronbach Alpha Test of Reliability Correlation Coefficients

The Cronbach Alpha Test of Reliability measures the internal consistency of items in a test (UCLA, 2021). Table 6 lists the correlation coefficients for responses to the MBI-ES and AWS for the Minnesota special education administrators who participated in this study. Correlation coefficients are listed for the three MBI-ES scales and the six AWS scales. Desired correlation coefficients for tests should be .70 or greater (Wheeler et al., 2011). Higher internal consistency is desired when research may lead to changes in practice: “Reliability coefficients of at least .70 were recommended for early stages of research, .80 in applied setting when cutoff scores are used, .90 in an applied setting if important decisions are being made...” (Wheeler et al., 2011, p. 241). The Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the three MBI-ES scales range from .69 to .92. The scale with the lowest correlation coefficient is the *depersonalization* scale (.69). The *personal accomplishment* scale has a Cronbach Alpha of .75 and the *emotional exhaustion* scale has a correlation coefficient of .92, which indicates a high degree of internal consistency. Correlation coefficients for the AWS scales range from .75 to .88, indicating acceptable to desired levels of internal consistency for all six scales. The scale with the lowest correlation coefficient is *fairness* (.75) and the scale with the greatest correlation coefficient is *reward* (.88).

Table 6

Cronbach Alpha Test of Reliability Correlation Coefficients for Subscales: Maslach Burnout Inventory and the Areas of Worklife Survey

Survey	Subscale	Cronbach Alpha
Maslach Burnout Inventory	*Emotional Exhaustion*	.92
	Depersonalization	.69
	Personal Accomplishment	.75
Areas of Worklife Survey	Workload	.78
	Control	.82
	Reward	.88
	Community	.83
	Fairness	.75
	Values	.85

Note. Cronbach alpha correlation coefficients of .70 or higher indicate acceptable internal consistency and a correlation coefficient of .75 or greater is desired.

Demographics of Sample

All participants in this research study are active members of the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) during the 2023-2024 school year. The entire sample currently works in special education administration. Based on reported position types in the MASE membership list, approximately 40% of the sample are executive directors, 14% are assistant directors, 41% are supervisors, managers, or coordinators, and 5% are in an unspecified special education administrator position. At the start of the questionnaire, participants were asked to identify their current position and were exited from the survey if their current position did not meet the inclusion criteria. Of the 234 respondents who started the survey, 42.31% are executive directors or directors, 19.23% are assistant directors, 33.76% are supervisors, managers, or coordinators, and 4.70% are in an unspecified special education administrator position (see

Table 7). Participants in the study work in different types of districts. Most of the sample, 53.88%, work in a single education district. 28.45% of respondents work in a special education cooperative, 10.34% work in an intermediate district and 7.33% in a charter school (see Table 8).

Table 7

Position Type of Survey Respondents

District Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Sample
Executive Director or Director of Special Education	99	42.31%
Assistant Director	45	19.23%
Special Education Supervisor, Manager, or Coordinator	79	33.76%
Other special education administrator position	11	4.7%

Table 8

Respondent Workplace

Position Type	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Sample
Single Education District	125	53.88%
Special Education Cooperative	66	28.45%
Intermediate District	24	10.34%
Charter School	17	7.33%

Respondents reported the number of years they have worked in special education administration. For “years in administration”, the greatest percentage of the sample (28.33%) has been in special education administration between six to ten years. Special education administrators with three to five years of experience are 25.75% of the sample. Those recently entering the field, 0-2 years, total 15.88% of the sample. Participants in the field 11-15 years constitute 12.02% of the sample and those with 15 or more years of experience are 18.03% of the sample (see Table 9). Respondents also reported their longevity in their current district. The

largest portion of the sample has been in their current district 0-2 years (26.29%). The smallest portion of the sample, 8.62%, has been with their current district 11-15 years. Individuals with three to five years with their current district are 19.83% of the sample, those with six to ten years 22.84% and those with 15 or more years are 22.41% of the sample (see Table 10).

Table 9

Respondent Years in Administration

Years in Administration	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Sample
0-2 years	37	15.88%
3-5 years	60	25.75%
6-10 years	66	28.33%
11-15 years	28	12.02%
15+ years	42	18.03%

Table 10

Respondent Years in Current District

Years in District	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Sample
0-2 years	61	26.29%
3-5 years	46	19.83%
6-10 years	53	22.84%
11-15 years	20	8.62%
15+ years	52	22.41%

Research Questions

The data collected in this study is presented in order of the three research questions. Question one and question two are analyzed with descriptive statistics. Question one examines the overall mean score and standard deviation for all participants across the three MBI scales.

The mean and standard scores are then calculated and analyzed based on the four demographic categories. Question two reports the mean and standard scores for the six AWS scales for the entire sample. The AWS data is then separated into the four demographic categories for further analysis. Question three uses the Pearson Correlation test to assess the degree of correlation between the three MBI scales and the six AWS scales.

Research Question One

How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their perceived level of burnout based on their self-rating across the following three scales: *emotional exhaustion*, *depersonalization*, and *personal accomplishment*?

Data presented in Table 11 shows the combined mean rating and standard deviations for three MBI scales for the 213 respondents. A score of 0 indicates the person has "never" experienced that feeling and a score of 6 indicates they experience that feeling "every day". A rating of 1, corresponds to "a few times a year", 2, to "once a month or less", 3, to "a few times a month", 4, to "once a week" and 5, to "a few times a week". Questions in the *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalization* scales correspond to negative job-related feelings and questions in the *personal accomplishment* scale correspond to positive job-related feelings.

Participants in the sample have a mean score of 3.07 for the *emotional exhaustion* scale, which corresponds with experiencing the identified feeling "a few times a month". The average rating for the *depersonalization* scale is 1.72, which falls between "a few times a year" to "once a month or less". For the positive job-related attitude questions regarding *personal accomplishment*, the sample has a mean score of 4.55, which falls between "once a week" to "a few times a week" of experienced feeling. All three of the scales have a standard deviation

between 1 and 2. The smallest variation in the sample is seen in the *personal accomplishment* scale with a standard deviation of 1.23 (see Table 11).

Table 11

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment Scales

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Emotional Exhaustion	3.07	1.58
Depersonalization	1.72	1.44
Personal Accomplishment	4.55	1.23

Note. Frequency scale: 0 = Never, 1 = a few times a year, 2 = once a month or less, 3 = a few times a month, 4 = once a week, 5 = a few times a week, 6 = everyday.

The mean and standard deviation scores for the three MBI scales are disaggregated in Table 12 by position type. The standard deviation for the MBI scales across position type ranges from 1.19 to 1.61 standard deviation. The MBI scale ranges from 0 to 6, where 0 indicates the person has "never" experienced that feeling and 6 indicates they experience that feeling "every day". The average *emotional exhaustion* score for each position type ranges from 2.86 to 3.31, with participants experiencing *emotional exhaustion* between "once a month or less" and "a few times a month". *Emotional exhaustion* is reported most frequently with special education supervisors, managers, or coordinators with an average score of 3.31 and least frequently with other special education administrator positions with a mean of 2.86. The average scores on the *depersonalization* scale range from 1.60 to 1.93 corresponding with experienced feeling between "a few times a year" and "once a month or less". *Depersonalization* is reported most frequently with individuals in other special education administrator positions with a mean score of 1.93 and least frequently with assistant directors with an average score of 1.60. *Personal accomplishment* scores range from 4.39 to 4.61 or experiencing *personal accomplishment* between "once a week"

to a “a few times a week”. *Personal accomplishment* is reported least frequently with individuals in other special education administrator positions with an average score of 4.39 and most frequently with both executive directors / directors and assistant directors, both having an average score of 4.61.

Table 12

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators’ Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment by Position Title

MBI Scales	Statistical Measure	Executive Director or Director	Assistant Director	Special Education Supervisor, Manager, or Coordinator	Other special education administrator position
Emotional	*M*	2.91	3.04	3.31	2.86
Exhaustion	*SD*	1.61	1.51	1.59	1.31
Depersonalization	*M*	1.71	1.60	1.76	1.93
	SD	1.48	1.33	1.47	1.19
Personal	*M*	4.61	4.61	4.48	4.39
Accomplishment	*SD*	1.20	1.21	1.22	1.51

Note. Frequency scale: 0 = Never, 1 = a few times a year, 2 = once a month or less, 3 = a few times a month, 4 = once a week, 5 = a few times a week, 6 = everyday.

Table 13 lists the mean and standard deviation scores for the three MBI scales based on district type. The standard deviation for the MBI scales across district type ranges from 1.12 to 1.62 standard deviation. The smallest variation is in the *personal accomplishment* scale, ranging from 1.12 to 1.32 standard deviations. The greatest variation is in the *emotional exhaustion* scale with standard deviations ranging from 1.47 to 1.62. The MBI scale ranges from 0 to 6, where 0 indicates the person has “never” experienced that feeling and 6 indicates they experience that feeling “every day”. The average *emotional exhaustion* score for each district type ranges from 2.69 to 3.18 aligning with experiencing the feeling between “once a month or less” and “a few

times a month". *Emotional exhaustion* is reported most frequently with administrators in single districts with an average rating of 3.18 and least frequently with those working in charter schools who report a mean score of 2.69. The mean *depersonalization* scores range from 1.57 to 1.78, corresponding to ratings between "a few times a year" to "once a month or less". *Depersonalization* is reported most frequently with administrators in intermediate districts with a mean score of 1.78 and least frequently with charter school administrators with an average score of 1.57. *Personal accomplishment* average scores range from 4.49 to 4.69, which aligns with a frequency of feeling between "once a week" to "a few times a week". *Personal accomplishment* is reported least frequently with those in intermediate districts with an average score of 4.49 and most frequently with charter school administrators with an average score of 4.69.

Table 13

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment by Type of District

MBI Scales	Statistical Measure	Single District	Cooperative	Intermediate	Charter
Emotional	*M*	3.18	2.96	3.14	2.69
Exhaustion	*SD*	1.6	1.54	1.62	1.47
Depersonalization	*M*	1.74	1.69	1.78	1.57
	SD	1.46	1.39	1.44	1.50
Personal	*M*	4.54	4.58	4.49	4.69
Accomplishment	*SD*	1.24	1.18	1.32	1.12

Note. Frequency scale: 0 = Never, 1 = a few times a year, 2 = once a month or less, 3 = a few times a month, 4 = once a week, 5 = a few times a week, 6 = everyday.

The mean and standard deviation scores for the three MBI scales are disaggregated by years in special education administration in Table 14. The standard deviation for the MBI scales based on number of years in special education administration ranges from 1.19 to 1.74. The

smallest variation is in the *personal accomplishment* scale, ranging from 1.19 to 1.24 standard deviations. Using a scale ranging from 0 to 6, where 0 indicates the person has "never" experienced that feeling and 6 indicates they experience that feeling "every day", the average *emotional exhaustion* score for each group ranges from 2.77 to 3.33 which corresponds with ratings between "once a month or less" and "a few times a month". *Emotional exhaustion* is reported most frequently with participants employed in special education administration 11-15 years with a mean score of 3.33 and least frequently with those with 15 or more years in special education with an average score of 2.77. *Depersonalization* average scores range from 1.41 to 2.20 which aligns with experienced feeling between "a few times a year" and "once a month or less". *Depersonalization* is reported most frequently with administrators employed in special education 11-15 years with an average score of 2.20 and least frequently with administrators with two or fewer years in administration for an average of 1.41. *Personal accomplishment* average scores range from 4.39 to 4.75, aligning between "once a week" and "a few times a week". *Personal accomplishment* is reported least frequently with administrators with 6-10 years of experience with a mean score of 4.39 and those with 11-15 years of experience with a mean score of 4.40 and most frequently with administrators who have been in special education administration for 15 or more years with an average score of 4.75.

Table 14

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment by Years in Special Education Administration

MBI Scales	Statistical Measure	0-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	15+
Emotional	*M*	2.86	3.21	3.16	3.33	2.77
Exhaustion	*SD*	1.57	1.68	1.45	1.63	1.57
Depersonalization	*M*	1.41	1.69	1.84	2.20	1.48
	SD	1.46	1.47	1.30	1.74	1.23
Personal	*M*	4.71	4.59	4.39	4.40	4.75
Accomplishment	*SD*	1.22	1.20	1.24	1.19	1.23

Note. Frequency scale: 0 = Never, 1 = a few times a year, 2 = once a month or less, 3 = a few times a month, 4 = once a week, 5 = a few times a week, 6 = everyday.

The mean and standard deviation scores for the three MBI scales, delineated by the number of years the administrator has been in their district, are listed in Table 15. The standard deviation for the MBI scales based on years in their current district ranges from 1.12 to 1.67. The smallest variation is in the *personal accomplishment* scale, ranging from 1.12 to 1.32 standard deviations. The greatest variation is in the *emotional exhaustion* scale with standard deviations ranging from 1.47 to 1.67. Using a scale ranging from 0 to 6, where 0 indicates the person has "never" experienced that feeling and 6 indicates they experience that feeling "every day", the average *emotional exhaustion* score for each group ranges from 2.54 to 3.44 which corresponds with ratings between "once a month or less" and "a few times a month". *Emotional exhaustion* is reported most frequently with participants who have been in their current district between three and five years with a mean rating of 3.44 and least frequently with those in their current district from 11-15 years with an average score of 2.54. *Depersonalization* average scores range from 1.59 to 1.88 which aligns with experienced feeling between "a few times a year" and "once a

month or less". *Depersonalization* is reported most frequently with administrators who have been in their current district between three and five years with an average rating of 1.88 and least frequently with administrators employed with their current district two or fewer years with an average rating of 1.59. *Personal accomplishment* average scores range from 4.42 to 4.77, aligning with a frequency of "once a week" and "a few times a week". *Personal accomplishment* is reported least frequently with administrators with 0-2 years in their district for an average score of 4.43 and those with 3-5 years of experience for an average rating of 4.42 and most frequently with administrators who have been with their district for 11-15 years with a mean score of 4.77.

Table 15

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment by Years in District

MBI Scales	Statistical Measure	0-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	15+
Emotional	*M*	2.91	3.44	3.13	2.54	3.11
Exhaustion	*SD*	1.59	1.47	1.55	1.50	1.67
Depersonalization	*M*	1.59	1.88	1.76	1.72	1.71
	SD	1.37	1.39	1.53	1.32	1.49
Personal	*M*	4.43	4.42	4.59	4.77	4.70
Accomplishment	*SD*	1.32	1.24	1.15	1.12	1.18

Note. Frequency scale: 0 = Never, 1 = a few times a year, 2 = once a month or less, 3 = a few times a month, 4 = once a week, 5 = a few times a week, 6 = everyday.

The special education administrators in this study, on average, feel emotionally exhausted a few times a month. They experience depersonalization toward the students or educators they serve a few times a year to once a month or less. They experience personal accomplishment once a week to a few times a week. The disaggregated groups that report relatively more *emotional*

exhaustion are: “supervisors, managers, or coordinators”, those working in single districts, those in special education administration 11-15 years and those in their current district 3-5 years.

Research Question Two

How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their job-person fit based on their self-rating across the following six scales: *workload, control, reward, community, fairness,* and *values*?

Data presented in Table 16 shows the combined mean rating and standard deviation for the six AWS scales across the 198 respondents. A rating of 1, indicates “strongly disagree” and a rating of 5, indicates “strongly agree”. A rating of 2 indicates “disagree”, 3 “hard to decide” and 4 “agree”. The six scales range in average job-person fit from 2.85-3.9. The scale with the highest degree of match is the *values* scale with a mean score of 3.90, falling between “hard to decide” and “agree”. The scale with the poorest fit or match is *fairness* with a mean score of 2.85 falling between “disagree” and “hard to decide”. All scales have a tight standard deviation ranging from .77 to 1.04, with the least variation in *values* and the greatest variation in *workload.*

Table 16

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators’ Job-Person Fit Scales

Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Workload	3.38	1.04
Control	3.79	.91
Reward	3.15	1.02
Community	3.48	.88
Fairness	2.85	.98
Values	3.90	.77

Note. Agreement scale from 1, strongly disagree to 5, strongly agree.

Table 17 lists the mean and standard deviation for the six AWS scales based on special education administrator position type. Standard deviations range from .61 to 1.11. A rating of 1, indicates “strongly disagree” and a rating of 5, indicates “strongly agree”. For executive directors and directors, the scale with the greatest degree of match is *control* with an average rating of 3.93 and the *values* scale rating in proximity at 3.90. Across all position categories, executive directors and directors have the highest reported match in *control.* For the remaining three position types, the highest match is observed in *values* with a mean score for assistant directors of 3.96, managers, supervisors or coordinators at 3.85, and individuals in other special education administrator positions with an average rating of 4.06. The area with the poorest match for all four position types is *fairness*, with a mean score between 2.78 and 2.88 across all four groups. Across all position categories, assistant directors have the higher degrees of match in *workload* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.41) and in *community* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.57) when compared to the other three groups. Across groups, managers, supervisors or coordinators, have the highest match for *fairness* ($\bar{x}$ = 2.88) and “other special education administrators” have the highest match for *reward* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.22) and *values* ($\bar{x}$ = 4.06) when comparing across groups.

Table 17

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Job-Person Fit Scales by Position

Position	Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Executive Director or Director	Workload	3.34	1.05
	Control	3.93	0.92
	Reward	3.19	1.02
	Community	3.53	0.94
	Fairness	2.84	1.01
	Values	3.90	0.88
Assistant Director	Workload	3.41	1.11
	Control	3.80	0.88
	Reward	3.17	0.97
	Community	3.57	0.80
	Fairness	2.82	0.95
	Values	3.96	0.70
Manager, Supervisor or Coordinator	Workload	3.40	0.95
	Control	3.65	0.88
	Reward	3.10	1.03
	Community	3.37	0.83
	Fairness	2.88	0.96
	Values	3.85	0.67
Other Special Education Administrator	Workload	3.38	0.96
	Control	3.50	0.93
	Reward	3.22	0.94
	Community	3.51	0.64
	Fairness	2.78	0.85
	Values	4.06	0.61

Note. Agreement scale from 1, strongly disagree to 5, strongly agree.

The mean and standard deviation for the six AWS scales based on type of district is reported in Table 18. Standard deviations range from .68 to 1.27. A rating of 1, indicates "strongly disagree" and a rating of 5, indicates "strongly agree". For single education districts, special education cooperatives, and intermediate districts the scale with the best job-person match is *values* with average ratings of 3.93, 3.87, and 3.99 respectively. Charter schools are matched most closely in *control* with an average rating of 3.88. The area with the poorest match is *fairness*, with a mean score between 2.63 and 2.98 across the four different district types, corresponding with a degree of match between "disagree" and "hard to decide". When comparing across groups, participants who work in intermediate districts have the highest reported match in five of the six scales: *workload* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.40), control ($\bar{x}$ = 3.90), *community* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.62), *fairness* ($\bar{x}$ = 2.98), and *values* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.99). Individuals who work in charter schools had the highest match in *reward* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.25), when comparing the four groups.

Table 18

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Job-Person Fit Scales by Type of District

Type of District	Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
Single Education District	Workload	3.36	1.02
	Control	3.78	0.94
	Reward	3.13	1.02
	Community	3.43	0.86
	Fairness	2.82	0.90
	Values	3.93	0.71
Special Education Cooperative	Workload	3.40	1.02
	Control	3.76	0.81
	Reward	3.17	1.02
	Community	3.57	0.88
	Fairness	2.88	0.99
	Values	3.87	0.78
Intermediate District	Workload	3.40	1.12
	Control	3.90	1.03
	Reward	3.13	0.96
	Community	3.62	0.68
	Fairness	2.98	1.13
	Values	3.99	0.97
Charter School	Workload	3.32	1.11
	Control	3.88	0.95
	Reward	3.25	0.91
	Community	3.32	1.27
	Fairness	2.63	1.18
	Values	3.70	0.78

Note. Agreement scale from 1, strongly disagree to 5, strongly agree.

Table 19 disaggregates the AWS data based on years in special education administration. Standard deviations range from .60 to 1.13. A rating of 1, indicates “strongly disagree” and a rating of 5, indicates “strongly agree”. Special education administrators in the following year groupings report that of the six categories, their job and their *values* are the most closely matched: 0-2 years ($\bar{x}$ =3.79), 3-5 years ($\bar{x}$ =3.92), 6-10 years ($\bar{x}$ = 3.98) and 15+ years ($\bar{x}$ = 3.97). Administrators practicing 11-15 years reported a closer match in *control* with an average score of 3.82. The area with the poorest match across all groups is *fairness*, with a mean score ranging from 2.76 and 2.93. Comparing across groups, administrators in special education between 6-10 years reported the highest match in the following areas: *workload* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.46), *control* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.88), *community* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.60), and values ($\bar{x}$ = 3.98). Administrators working in special education administration 15 or more years reported the same level of agreement for *control* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.88) and their score for *values* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.97) was similar as well. Comparing across groups, administrators working in special education between 11 to 15 years had the lowest reported scores for *workload* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31), *fairness* ($\bar{x}$ = 2.76), and *values* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.73). Individuals working 0-2 years had the lowest scores in *control* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.66) and *community* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.39) and those working 3-5 years had a similar low score for *community* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.38).

Table 19

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Job-Person Fit Scales by Years in Special Education Administration

Years in Administration	Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
0-2 years	Workload	3.35	1.00
	Control	3.66	0.78
	Reward	3.14	0.88
	Community	3.39	0.85
	Fairness	2.93	0.93
	Values	3.79	0.70
3-5 years	Workload	3.37	1.04
	Control	3.69	0.89
	Reward	3.14	1.13
	Community	3.38	0.93
	Fairness	2.83	0.99
	Values	3.92	0.71
6-10 years	Workload	3.46	1.05
	Control	3.88	0.88
	Reward	3.14	1.01
	Community	3.60	0.77
	Fairness	2.79	0.93
	Values	3.98	0.61
11-15 year	Workload	3.31	0.91
	Control	3.82	0.93
	Reward	3.15	0.94
	Community	3.51	0.82
	Fairness	2.76	0.97
	Values	3.73	1.03
15+ years	Workload	3.35	1.09
	Control	3.88	1.04
	Reward	3.22	1.00
	Community	3.50	0.96
	Fairness	2.94	1.02
	Values	3.97	0.90

Note. Agreement scale from 1, strongly disagree to 5, strongly agree.

AWS data separated by the number of years administrators have been in their current district is listed in Table 20. Standard deviations range from .73 to 1.11. A rating of 1, indicates

"strongly disagree" and a rating of 5, indicates "strongly agree". Special education administrators who have been in their district: 0-2 years ($\bar{x}$ =3.86), 3-5 years ($\bar{x}$ = 3.76), and 15+ years ($\bar{x}$ = 4.07) report that they experience the greatest degree of job-person fit in *values*. Administrators in their district 6-10 years and 11-15 years report a closer match in *control* with average scores of 3.92 and 4.22 respectively. Across all groups, the area with the poorest match is *fairness*, with a mean score between 2.78 and 2.90. Comparing groups, individuals who have been with their current district between 11 and 15 years, reported the highest scores for four of the six areas: *workload* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.41), *control* ($\bar{x}$ = 4.22), *community* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.76), and *fairness* ($\bar{x}$ = 2.90). Individuals working between six to ten years in their current district reported the highest score in *reward* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.19) and those working 15 or more years reported the highest score in *values* ($\bar{x}$ = 4.07). Administrators working 11-15 years in their district reported similar values mean scores of 4.06. Across groups, individuals working in their current district three to five years, reported the lowest scores in *control* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.53), *community* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.39), *fairness* ($\bar{x}$ = 2.78), and *values* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.76). Individuals in their current district zero to two years reported the lowest scores in *workload* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31) and *reward* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.12).

Table 20

Combined Mean Rating of Special Education Administrators' Job-Person Fit Scales by Years in District

Years in District	Scale	Mean	Standard Deviation
0-2 years	Workload	3.31	1.06
	Control	3.68	0.84
	Reward	3.12	0.94
	Community	3.46	0.83
	Fairness	2.89	0.92
	Values	3.86	0.73
3-5 years	Workload	3.39	1.03
	Control	3.53	0.97
	Reward	3.16	1.10
	Community	3.39	0.91
	Fairness	2.78	1.03
	Values	3.76	0.77
6-10 years	Workload	3.40	0.94
	Control	3.92	0.81
	Reward	3.19	1.05
	Community	3.52	0.80
	Fairness	2.88	0.89
	Values	3.87	0.79
11-15 year	Workload	3.41	1.07
	Control	4.22	0.81
	Reward	3.12	1.10
	Community	3.76	0.87
	Fairness	2.90	1.11
	Values	4.06	0.75
15+ years	Workload	3.40	1.10
	Control	3.85	0.97
	Reward	3.16	0.97
	Community	3.46	0.93
	Fairness	2.80	1.04
	Values	4.07	0.76

Note. Agreement scale from 1, strongly disagree to 5, strongly agree.

The special education administrators in this sample, on average have the greatest fit with *values* and the poorest fit with *fairness*. All disaggregated groups reported the poorest match in *fairness.* There was some variation across demographic groups for the greatest fit, but most groups reported the greatest fit in *values.* The disaggregated groups with the poorest overall job-person fit are the administrators in special education administration 11-15 years and those in their current district 3-5 years. The administrators that reported the greatest degree of job-person fit are administrators working in intermediate districts, those in special education administration 6-10 years and those in their current district 11-15 years.

Research Question Three

What is the association between Minnesota special education administrators' perceptions of their job-person fit across the six areas of worklife and their perceived level of burnout in the areas of *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment*?

"Researchers use correlation to explore the relationships among a series of variables they suspect may be important to a research question" (Abbott & McKinney, 2013, p. 128). In this study, the relationship between perceived level of burnout and job-person fit is examined. Tables 21, 22, and 23 show the correlation coefficients and *p*-values for the six AWS subscales when compared to the three MBI-ES subscales. Table 21 examines the association between the *emotional exhaustion* subscale and the AWS scales. The *workload* subscale of the AWS shows a moderate negative correlation (-0.50) to the *emotional exhaustion* subscale with a statistical significance of < 0.0001. The remaining five AWS scales have a weak negative correlation ranging from –0.22 to –0.38 with a statistical significance ranging from < 0.001 to 0.0018. Table 22 reviews the MBI scale of *depersonalization* with the AWS scales. All six AWS scales

appear to have a weak negative correlation (-0.16 to –0.21) with a statistical significance ranging from 0.0036 to 0.757. When comparing the *personal accomplishment* subscale and the AWS scales, there appears to be no correlation between the *workload* subscale with a statistical significance of 0.9832 and a weak positive correlation for the remaining five AWS subscales ranging from 0.29 to 0.39 with a statistical significance of <0.0001 (as noted in Table 23).

Table 21

Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the Emotional Exhaustion Subscale of the MBI and the AWS Subscales

Emotional Exhaustion		
Scale	Coefficient	*p*-Value
Workload	-0.50	<.0001***
Control	-0.38	<.0001***
Reward	-0.30	<.0001***
Community	-0.26	0.0018**
Fairness	-0.33	<.0001***
Values	-0.22	0.0016**

Note. A p-value of less than 0.05 is labeled with one star (*), a p-value of less than 0.01 with 2 stars (**) and a p-value less than 0.001 with three stars (***)

Table 22

Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the Depersonalization Subscale of the MBI and the AWS Subscales

Depersonalization		
Scale	Coefficient	*p*-Value
Workload	-0.20	0.0058**
Control	-0.17	0.0172*
Reward	-0.20	0.0049**
Community	-0.13	0.0757
Fairness	0.21	0.0036**
Values	-0.16	0.0272*

Note. A p-value of less than 0.05 is labeled with one star (*), a p-value of less than 0.01 with 2 stars (**) and a p-value less than 0.001 with three stars (***).

Table 23

Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the Personal Accomplishment Subscale of the MBI and the AWS Subscales

Personal Accomplishment		
Scale	Coefficient	*p*-Value
Workload	0.00	0.9832
Control	0.34	<.0001***
Reward	0.30	<.0001***
Community	0.30	<.0001***
Fairness	0.29	<.0001***
Values	0.39	<.0001***

Note. A p-value of less than 0.05 is labeled with one star (*), a p-value of less than 0.01 with 2 stars (**) and a p-value less than 0.001 with three stars (***).

Across the special education administrators in this sample, there is a moderate negative correlation between *emotional exhaustion* and *workload* and a weak negative correlation between the remaining five areas of job-person fit (i.e., *control*, *reward*, *community*, *fairness*, and *values.* There is a weak correlation between *depersonalization* and all five areas of job-

person fit. There was a weak positive correlation between *personal accomplishment* and five of the six areas of job person fit (i.e., *control*, *reward*, *community*, *fairness*, and *values*) and no correlation between *personal accomplishment* and *workload.*

Open-Ended Response

Of the 213 respondents who participated in the questionnaire, 74, or 35% also provided additional feedback when given the prompt "Do you have any additional comments or thoughts related to special education administrator burnout, engagement or job-person fit that you would like to share?" Participants shared comments regarding what they attribute to be the cause of burnout, suggestions for how to reduce burnout, miscellaneous comments about the survey and factors that may impact burnout. Of the 74 responses, 31 different factors that could contribute to burnout were listed. The most prevalent responses for what contribute to burnout are staffing shortage, the position being exhausting/demanding, and a lack of understanding/ acceptance of the special education field and students receiving special education services. 22 of the 74 comments, or 30%, related to staff hiring, retention or recruitment. 12 of the 74 comments, or 16%, specifically referenced staffing shortage as a factor impacting burnout. Six out of 74, or 8%, cited the demands of the position and six out of 74 (8%) indicated lack of acceptance or understanding of special education as contributing to burnout. Of the 74 responses, 23 different suggestions for reducing burnout were offered. The most common strategies listed to help reduce burnout are having a support system at work, having a balance between work and home life and having clear boundaries at work. Seven out of 74 comments, or 9.5% attributed reduced burnout to having supportive teams at work. Seven out of 74 responses, or 9.5%, listed work/home balance / clear boundaries at work as a factor for reduced burnout. Other comments included

appreciation for the study (7% of respondents), different positions / district impacting burnout differently (4% of respondents) and planning to leave the profession (4% of respondents).

Summary

Chapter 4 reviewed the results of the "Special Education Administrator Job Attitude Questionnaire" which includes the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES), the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS), demographic questions, and one open-ended question. Response rate and the demographics of the sample were listed. Descriptive statistics including mean and standard deviation were reported for the full sample. Additionally, these descriptive statistics were reported for each subgroup based on position type, district type, years in special education administration, and years in current district. The degree of correlation between the three MBI scales and the six AWS scales was also reported.

Chapter 5 will provide a summary of the study and implications for future research and practice. The chapter will include relevant conclusions and a discussion of the results. When applicable, results will be compared with existing research. Limitations for the study will be outlined and suggestions for current practice and future research will be included.

Chapter 5: Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate Minnesota special education administrators' perception of their degree of burnout and level of job-person fit in their current position. Additional analysis focused on how position type, district type, years in special education administration, and years in current district may influence those experiences and perceptions. Participants' perceptions of their level of burnout and degree of job-person fit were analyzed to see what degree of correlation might exist.

Summary of the Study

Occupational burnout research has identified individual and organizational correlates of burnout. The individual's degree of job-person fit with their organization, however, appears more important than specific individual and organizational correlates (Maslach & Leiter, 2022). In this study, Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) members were surveyed using a variation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Education (MBI-ES), the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS) and one open-ended question. Additional demographic information regarding type of position, type of district, years in special education administration and years in current district were collected.

On average, special education administrators in this study experience *emotional exhaustion* a few times a month. Despite the somewhat frequent experience of *emotional exhaustion*, the surveyed special education administrators experience depersonalization rarely (a few times a year to once a month or less) and personal accomplishment often (once a week to a few times a week). When disaggregating the data, the groups that report the highest relative *emotional exhaustion* are "special education supervisor, manager, or coordinator", those working

in single education districts, individuals who have been in special education administration 11-15 years and those in their current district 3-5 years. Groups with the lowest average *emotional exhaustion* scores were “other special education administrators”, those working in charter schools, individuals who have been in special education administration 15 or more years and those in their current district 11-15 years. In the area of depersonalization, “other special education administrators”, those working in charter schools, individuals in special education administration 11-15 years and those in their current position 3-5 years, had the highest average ratings. Assistant directors, those working in charter schools, individuals in special education and in their district 2 or fewer years reported the lowest average scores in depersonalization. Personal accomplishment was the lowest for “other administrators”, those in intermediate districts, individuals in special education administration 6-10 or 11-15 years and those in their current district 0-2 years. The groups with the highest reported personal accomplishment were executive directors and assistant directors, individuals employed in charter schools, those in special education 15 or more years and those in their current district 11-15 years.

When rating their degree of match with their current position, the highest degree of match was reported with values and the lowest degree of match with fairness. When separating participants based on position, executive directors were the only position that rated something higher than values (i.e., control). Across all four demographic variables, the poorest match was fairness, in every group. Based on type of district, special education administrators employed in intermediate schools had the highest degree of match in five of the six categories. When looking at the number of years individuals have been in special education administration, those with 6-10 years of experience had the best match in four of the six areas and individuals with 11-15 years

had the poorest match in three of the six areas. Based on number of years in their current district, those with 11-15 years had the greatest match in four out of six areas and those with 3-5 years of experience had the poorest match in four out of six areas.

When examining the association between the three burnout scales and the six areas of worklife survey (AWS) scales, a moderate negative correlation was observed between *emotional exhaustion* and workload. The remaining AWS scales had a weak negative correlation with *emotional exhaustion*. For depersonalization, there was a weak negative correlation across all AWS scales. In the area of personal accomplishment there appeared to be no correlation with workload and a weak positive correlation for the remaining five AWS scales.

Common themes were found in the open-ended responses. 74 individuals, or 35% of participants, contributed additional comments and thoughts. Most of the open-ended comments related to what may contribute to burnout or what could reduce burnout. The most common factors attributed to burnout were staffing shortage, the demands of the position, and lack of understanding and acceptance of special education. The most frequently identified factors to reduce burnout were the presence of a support system, having clear boundaries with home and work and an appropriate work-life balance.

Conclusions

This study was centered around three research questions. The first question looked at perceptions of burnout and work engagement, the second at perceptions of job-person fit, and the third with the degree of association between those perceptions. Conclusions for each research question will be included in the order presented.

Research Question One

1. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their perceived level of burnout based on their self-rating across the following three scales: *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment*?

The special education administrators in this study, on average, feel emotionally exhausted a few times a month. They experience depersonalization toward the students or educators they serve a few times a year to once a month or less. They experience personal accomplishment once a week to a few times a week.

Data for this research question was collected from responses to the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES). The MBI-ES asks participants to rate the frequency they experience a feeling on a scale of 0 to 6, with 0 indicating "never" experiencing the feeling and 6 indicating experiencing the feeling "every day". The MBI-ES questions fit into the following three scales: *emotional exhaustion, depersonalization,* and *personal accomplishment*. *Emotional Exhaustion* is the, "...tired and fatigued feeling that develops as emotional energies are drained" (Maslach et al., 2018, p. 31). *Depersonalization* scale questions measure the degree of indifference and feelings about the individuals the person works with. The *personal accomplishment* scale assesses how competent the person feels in their position. Across the sample of 213 respondents, participants had an average score of 3.07 for *emotional exhaustion*, indicating they experience that feeling "a few times a month". For the full sample, the mean rating for the *depersonalization* scale was 1.72 indicating that they experience depersonalization "a few times a year" to "once a month or less". The last scale, *personal accomplishment*,

received an average score of 4.55 indicating participants experience that feeling between “once a week” to “a few times a week”.

When the data was disaggregated by position type, *emotional exhaustion* scale scores ranged from 2.86 to 3.31, *depersonalization* from 1.60-1.93 and *personal accomplishment* from 4.39 to 4.61. For the *emotional exhaustion* subscale, special education supervisors, managers and coordinators reported the highest mean score (3.31), and other special education administrators reported the lowest mean score (2.86). For *depersonalization* scale, other special education administrators reported the highest average score (1.93), and assistant directors reported the lowest (1.60). For *personal accomplishment* scale both executive directors/ directors and assistant directors reported the highest mean score (4.61), and other special education administrators reported the lowest mean score (4.39). When the data was separated by district type, *emotional exhaustion* scores range from 2.69 to 3.18, *depersonalization* from 1.57-1.78 and *personal accomplishment* from 4.49 to 4.69. Participants working in charter schools reported the lowest scores in *emotional exhaustion* (2.69) and *depersonalization* (1.57) and the highest average score in *personal accomplishment* (4.69). Participants employed in intermediate school districts reported the highest average score in *depersonalization* (1.78) *and* the lowest score in *personal accomplishment* (4.49). The highest mean score for *emotional exhaustion* (3.18) was reported by participants employed in single districts.

When the data was disaggregated by years in special education administration *emotional exhaustion* scores ranged from 2.77 to 3.33, *depersonalization* from 1.41-2.20 and *personal accomplishment* from 4.39 to 4.75. Administrators with 15 or more years of experience in special education had the lowest average score for *emotional exhaustion* (2.77) and the highest average

score for *personal accomplishment* (4.75). Administrators who have worked in special education administration for 0-2 years, had the lowest mean scores for *depersonalization* (1.41). Administrators in the field for 11-15 years had the highest average scores for *emotional exhaustion* (3.33) and for *depersonalization* (2.20). The lowest average *personal accomplishment* scores were seen from administrators working in the field between six and ten years (4.39). When the data was separated by years administrators were employed in their current district *emotional exhaustion* scores ranged from 2.91 to 3.44, *depersonalization* from 1.59-1.88 and *personal accomplishment* from 4.42 to 4.77. Administrators working in their current district between three and five years had the highest average scores for *emotional exhaustion* (3.44) and *depersonalization* (1.88) and the lowest average score for *personal accomplishment* (4.42). Administrators in their first two years with their current district reported the lowest mean scores for *emotional exhaustion* (2.91) and *depersonalization* (1.59). Administrators who have been in their district 11-15 years reported the highest average rating for *personal accomplishment* (4.77), with administrators with 15+ years next in line (4.70)

Research Question Two

2. How do Minnesota special education administrators rate their job-person fit based on their self-rating across the following six scales: workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values?

Across the sample, the scale with the greatest degree of match is values and the scale with the poorest match is fairness. When disaggregating the data based on demographic group, there appeared to be a greater degree of job-person fit with individuals in intermediate districts, those in special education 6-10 years and those in their current district 11-15 years. Individuals in

charter schools, those in special education 11-15 years and those in their current district 3-5 showed reduced degrees of job-person fit.

Participants' degree of job-person fit was assessed based on their responses to the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS). The AWS asks participants to rate their level of agreement with statements using a scale ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree". Across the 198 participants who completed the AWS questions, the mean scores for the six scales ranged from 2.85-3.9. The scale with the highest degree of match was the *values* scale with a mean score of 3.90, which aligns between "hard to decide" and "agree". The scale with the lowest average score across the sample was *fairness*, with a mean score of 2.85, which aligns between "disagree" and "hard to decide".

When the data was disaggregated by position type, all four groups rated the *fairness* scale to have the poorest fit. All groups, except executive directors/directors, rated the *values* scale as the best fit, with executive directors/ directors rating the *control* scale as the best match. When reviewing the data based on type of district, individuals working in intermediate districts had the highest average ratings in five out of the six scales (all scales except *reward* which was higher for individuals in charter schools). Individuals employed in charter schools had the lowest average fit rating in four out of the six scales (i.e., *workload, community, fairness, values).* When looking at job-person match based on years in special education administration, participants who have been in special education 6-10 years had the highest average scores in four out of the six AWS scales (i.e., *workload, control, community,* and *values)*. For years in their current district, individuals in their district 11-15 years had the highest mean scores in four out of the six scales (i.e., *workload*, *control*, *community*, and *fairness*). Individuals working in their current district

3-5 years had the lowest average scores in three out of six areas (i.e., *control*, *community*, and *fairness*) and those in their current districts 0-2 years had the lowest average scores in two of six areas (i.e., *workload* and *reward*)

Research Question Three

3. What is the association between Minnesota special education administrators' perceptions of their job-person fit across the six areas of worklife and their perceived level of burnout in the areas of *emotional exhaustion*, *depersonalization*, and *personal accomplishment*?

The association between perceived level of burnout and job-person fit was assessed by calculating Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the three scales of the MBI-ES and the six scales of the AWS. The *workload* scale showed a moderate negative correlation (-0.50) to *emotional exhaustion* with a statistical significance of <0.0001. There was a weak negative correlation found between the six AWS scales and the *depersonalization* MBI-ES scale. There appeared to be no correlation between the *personal accomplishment* scale of the MBI and the *workload* subscale of the AWS and a weak correlation between the remaining five AWS scales.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to survey Minnesota special education administrators to determine their perceived level of burnout and their degree of job-person fit with their current organization / position. The information was gathered to identify any potential trends or correlations. Assessing for trends in burnout and job-person fit across special education administrators was conducted in hopes of finding ways to improve work engagement for special education administrators, thereby benefiting special education teachers and students receiving

special education services. The sections below will review the perceived level of burnout and job-person fit reported by special education administrators in this study. The data is then compared with existing normative data and previous studies.

Perceived Level of Burnout

All three MBI scales *(emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment*), should be viewed separately and not combined into a single score. Additionally, there is not one score that indicates whether a person is "burned out" (Maslach & Leiter, 2028). Instead, the MBI scores indicate the frequency that an individual is experiencing each aspect of burnout, and the interpretation of the severity or impact is determined by the person reviewing the data and addressing any identified concerns (Maslach & Leither, 2028). The MBI-ES asks participants to rate how often they have experienced a feeling from a level of 0 (never experience) to 6 (experience every day). This study showed that on average, the sample of Minnesota special education administrators in the study experience *emotional exhaustion* an average of a few times a month ($\bar{x}$ = 3.07), *depersonalization* between a few times a year to once a month or less ($\bar{x}$ = 1.72) and *personal accomplishment* between once a week to a few times a week ($\bar{x}$ = 4.55).

When looking at the MBI data across different demographic groups, administrators employed in charter schools had lower *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalization* scores and higher *personal accomplishment* ratings. This could be related to charter schools often being smaller and focusing on specific programs (e.g., project-based learning, language immersion, online learning, etc.). Based on position title, "special education supervisors, managers and coordinators" had the highest average rating of *emotional exhaustion* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.31) which could be

related to increased amount of work the middle managers may face. Middle managers often spend significant time supporting staff and students in the school buildings but also working on systemwide initiatives and work for their special education director and superintendent. Individuals who have been in the special education field 11-15 years had the highest ratings for *emotional exhaustion* ($\bar{x}$ = 3.33) and *depersonalization* ($\bar{x}$ = 2.20) and the second lowest, .01 away from the lowest, *personal accomplishment* score ($\bar{x}$ = 4.40). It could initially be interpreted that increased years in special education result in increased burnout however the participants in this study who have been employed in special education 15 or more years reported the lowest levels of *emotional exhaustion* ($\bar{x}$ = 2.77) and the highest levels of *personal accomplishment* ($\bar{x}$ = 4.75). This could indicate that there are other factors contributing to development of burnout beyond the years in special education administration. Special education administrators employed in their current district for 3-5 years had the highest average ratings for *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalization* and the lowest average score for *personal accomplishment.* Once in an organization for 3-5 years, administrators may be a part of more initiatives or projects and may experience disillusion over dealing with similar problems without resolution. It should be noted that participant's ages were not collected in this study. It is possible, the individuals employed in special education for 11-15 years and those in their district for 3-5 years are at similar stages in their lives, which could include similar homelife stressors, potentially impacting their levels of burnout.

Maslach and colleagues provide normative data for the Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) in the MBI manual (Maslach et al., 2018). The MBI-GS differs slightly from the MBI-ES. The MBI-GS has the following three scales: *emotional exhaustion,*

cynicism, and *professional efficacy.* The MBI-ES also has the *emotional exhaustion* scale but labels the *cynicism* scale as *depersonalization* and the *professional efficacy* scale as *personal accomplishment* to reflect more accurately working in education. Table 24 compares the mean and standard deviations for this study with the combined mean and standard deviations of the MBI-GS from databases shared with Leiter and Schaufeli from 1996 to 2015. Even though the MBI-GS is highly correlated with the other MBI versions, the reader should compare with caution as the MBI-GS differs slightly from the MBI-ES as it is normed and targets a broader group of occupations and uses the term *recipient* instead of *student*.

The special education administrators in this sample, on average, reported higher levels of *emotional exhaustion* than the normative sample (.81 higher frequency on a 6-point scale). This could indicate that the emotional demands and amount of work expected with the special education administrator position is higher than other professions. The mean scores for *cynicism* / *depersonalization* were similar between the two groups with an average score of 1.74 in the *combined database* and an average score of 1.72 for the special education administrators in this study. In the area of *professional efficacy* / *personal accomplishment,* the special education administrators in this sample had a slightly increased average score of 4.55 compared to the *combined databases'* average score of 4.34.

It appears that of the three scales, *emotional exhaustion* is the biggest concern for special education administrators in this study. This finding appears consistent with the anecdotal reports from special education administration in Minnesota. Special education administrators, this researcher included, have difficulty taking days off work and are often working outside of normal business hours and into weekends to keep up with the demands of the position. While

exhaustion alone does not equate with burnout, it can pose a significant problem for the special education administrators as well as the educators and students they serve: “People experiencing burnout are not simply fatigued or overwhelmed by their workload. They also have lost a psychological connection with their work that has implications for their motivation and their identity” (Maslach & Leiter, 2017, p. 41). *Emotional exhaustion* could be an early warning sign for the development of burnout. It is also possible that high levels of *emotional exhaustion* could act as a catalyst to developing increased levels of depersonalization and decreased levels of personal accomplishment: “The occurrence and etiology of burnout begins with exhaustion, which often starts the domino effect” (Malsch & Leiter, 2022, p. 53). If special education administrators begin to feel disconnected from the individuals they serve and ineffective at their work, there could be an increase in special education administrator attrition and a degradation of the quality of administrator support that special education teachers and students receive.

Table 24

Comparison of Mean and Standard Deviations for MBI-GS and Study Sample

	Exhaustion	*Cynicism / Depersonalization*	*Professional Efficacy / Personal Accomplishment*
Combined Database*			
Mean	2.26	1.74	4.34
Standard Deviation	1.47	1.36	1.17
Study Sample			
Mean	3.07	1.72	4.55
Standard Deviation	1.58	1.44	1.23

Note. The *combined database* information comprises data from 1996 to 2015 by several international scholars combined by Leiter and Schaufeli. (Maslach & Leiter, 2018, p. 47).

Ferris and Ruff (2011) conducted a study of special education administrators in Montana using the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (MBI-ES). Their study found similar mean

scores as this study for the *emotional exhaustion* scale (2.97, this study found 3.07) but much higher levels of *depersonalization* (3.00, this study found 1.72) and lower levels of *personal accomplishment* (2.64, this study found 4.55). This could indicate that while the administrators in this study are experiencing *emotional exhaustion* a few times a month but that the demands of the job do not appear, at least currently, to be negatively impacting their feelings towards the students and educators they work with nor the competence or personal accomplishment they feel in their position. It could also indicate that other factors positively contribute to their perceived level of accomplishment and depersonalization. The relatively high levels of *personal accomplishment* reported in this sample of Minnesota special education administrators is promising for the profession and for the individuals these administrators serve. If administrators feel effective in their work, they are more likely to persevere during challenging times and put in the time and effort required to support special education programs, teachers, and students (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Job-Person Fit

"To fix burnout, individuals and organizations must first identify the areas in which their mismatches lie, and then tailor solutions to improve the fit within each area" (Maslach & Leiter, 2005, p. 44). The special education administrators in this study rated their degree of job-person fit by answering questions from the Areas of Worklife Survey (AWS). Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree" for questions in the areas of: *workload, control, reward, community, fairness,* and *values*. Based on the special education administrators' mean ratings of the AWS questions there were no scales with ratings that equate to "agree" or "strongly agree" and no scales that administrators rated as "strongly

disagree". Average mean scores for the six AWS scales ranged from 2.85 to 3.90, which ranges from "disagree" to "hard to decide". The area with the best fit for special education administrators in this sample was the *values* subscale with a mean score of 3.90. This finding seems to align with the work that the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) organization has done on "finding your why". In this initiative they encourage administrators to remember why they entered the profession and to center their work around their values. The sample of special education administrators in this study had little variation in their *value* fit rating with a standard deviation of .77. This could indicate that special education administrators in this study feel a similar connection to their work and the individuals that they serve. It may also support that on average, special education administrators place a high importance on ethical leadership. This dedication to values and ethical leadership is positive for the organization and the students. Dedication to the profession can, however, leave special education administrators more prone to *emotional exhaustion* or decreased personal accomplishment when the demands of the job make it difficult to help special education staff and students. When special education administrators care so much about the work they do and the people they serve, not meeting their needs, despite significant effort can leave them feeling hopeless.

The scale the participants rated the lowest was *fairness*, with an average rating of 2.85. Questions in the *fairness* subscale ask participants about how just or fair money is allocated, decisions are made, and people are treated. The *fairness* scale was rated as the area with lowest match across the full sample and in each of the disaggregated groups. One possible reason for the decreased *fairness* scores could be how special education administrators are treated compared to general education administrators and the lack of understanding of special education. Nine of the

74 open-ended responses (12%) from participants in this study alluded to perceived unfairness. Six of the 74 (8%) responses mentioned lack of understanding or lack of acceptance for special education students and staff and three of 74 (4%) indicated not be treated as equals when compared to general education administrators. Additionally, perceived unfairness could be related to lack of appropriate and adequate funding for special education programs and services. Currently, districts in Minnesota deal with special education costs that exceed the revenue from the state and federal government (Abram, 2023). This gap in funding is known as the *cross subsidy*. The *cross subsidy* continues to increase, resulting in special education administrators trying to operate with less funding despite increased mandates, and negatively impacting school districts general education funding (Abram, 2023).

When the data was disaggregated by demographic subgroups, individuals working in intermediate districts reported the greatest relative fit in five out of six areas and charter schools reported the lowest relative fit in four out of six areas. Intermediate districts are specialty school districts that serve multiple school districts for a specific purpose. They are funded differently and provide various services based on the needs of the students. It is possible that special education administrators employed in intermediate districts experience benefits from job-person fit based on how the district is funded or perhaps feel a greater connection and therefore job-person fit because of the specific students they are serving. Charter schools, however, also specialize in serving a particular group of students. It is possible that the difference in benefits and structure of a charter school may negatively impact the job-person fit they experience. Special education administrators with 6-10 years of experience had the highest relative match in four out of six areas and those in their current district 11-15 years had the highest match in four

out of six areas. It seems likely that individuals working in special education and their districts longer have remained employed because they have a good job-person match or perhaps the longer they stay in the field or specific organization the easier it is to mold the organization or position to match their preferences.

The AWS manual includes data from their normative sample of over 22,500 employees from a variety of organization types (Leiter & Maslach, 2006, 2011). Table 25 lists the average mean scores and standard deviations for the normative sample as compared with the special education administrators in this study. When looking at job-person fit in this sample, on average, special education administrators had a higher job-person fit in the areas of *workload, control,* and *values* with a higher mean rating by .42, .48, and .66 respectively. The special education administrators in this sample reported similar job-person fit ratings to the normative sample in *reward, community,* and *fairness* with a difference in average ratings of -.04, .10 and .07, respectively. This may indicate that while special education administrators in this sample do not report a high degree of job-person match in the six areas of worklife, relatively speaking, they report a higher degree of match in three of the six areas and a similar degree of match in the remaining three areas, when compared to the normative sample. A better job-person match in special education administrators compared to the normative sample could result in increased resilience and perseverance when these administrators are met with obstacles.

Table 25

Comparison of Mean and Standard Deviations for AWS Normative Sample and Study Sample

	AWS Normative Sample		Special Education Administrators	
Subscale	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
Workload	2.96	.80	3.38	1.04
Control	3.31	.86	3.79	.91
Reward	3.19	.89	3.15	1.02
Community	3.38	.84	3.48	.88
Fairness	2.78	.80	2.85	.98
Values	3.24	.79	3.90	.77

Note. Normative AWS data from the AWS Manual (Leiter & Maslach, 2011, p. 14).

The AWS manual also provides cut off scores for each AWS scale to assist in determining high, moderate, and low scores for job-person fit. Table 26 lists the cut off scores for the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles based on the normative data from the AWS manual (Leiter & Maslach, 2011). The authors highlight that the subscales have a consistent linear relationship and that the responses just below a specific cut score do not differ qualitatively from scores just above the cut score (Leiter & Maslach, 2011). Of the six subscales, four subscales reside above the 50th percentile but below the 75th percentile: *workload*, *control*, *community*, and *fairness*. One subscale falls above the 25th percentile but below the 50th percentile (i.e., *reward*). One subscale is above the 75th percentile (i.e., *values*). Based on the cut scores, it appears that the special education administrators in this study have a high degree of job-person fit in *values*, a moderate fit in *workload*, *control*, *community*, and *fairness* and a relatively poor fit for *reward.*

Correlation Between Burnout and Job-Person Fit

Leiter and Maslach (2011) have found correlations between the subscales of the MBI and AWS: “The relationship between AWS and exhaustion and cynicism are clear. Positive scores in

AWS are negatively correlated with exhaustion and cynicism, but positively correlated with efficacy" (p. 15). In this study, there appears to be a moderate negative association between how well-matched the special education administrators feel based on the *workload* scale and their level of *emotional exhaustion*. The AWS questions in the *workload* subscale focus on the amount of work the person has in comparison to the time available during the workday to complete it. This negative correlation between workload fit and *emotional exhaustion* is consistent with Leiter and Maslach's (1999) findings: "Increasing workload has a consistent relationship with burnout, especially with *emotional exhaustion*" (p. 475).

The results from this study appear to be consistent with the findings of Austrian workers conducted by Jiminez and Dunkl in 2017, educators in the United States by Russel and colleagues in 2020, and operating nurses in Poland by Jarzynkowski and colleagues in 2021. For special education administrators specifically, the findings from this study appear to be in line with the 1982 survey of Illinois special education administrators by Begley and the Luckner and Movahedazarhouligh study in 2019 that highlighted the expanding workload of special education administrators. It seems likely that the poorer the match between an individual's ideal workload and their actual workload, the more likely they are to become emotionally exhausted. There were six participants (approximately 8% of the open-ended responses) in the study who included comments about their level of exhaustion and the number of demanding tasks as contributing to burnout.

In addition to reviewing the MBI mean scale scores, Maslach and Leiter (2022) outline how the results of the MBI, in conjunction with the job person-fit can be analyzed in terms of "burnout profiles". The five burnout profiles include: *burnout, overextended, ineffective,*

disengaged, and *engagement* (see Table 26). Maslach and Leiter recommend looking at the profiles rather than a dichotomous view of "burned out" or "engaged" because it allows employers and researchers to better understand the reason or reasons for the mismatch providing an opportunity for more individualized solutions (2021).

Table 26

Burnout Profiles

	MBI	Job-Person Fit
Burnout Profiles		
Burnout	High levels of *emotional exhaustion* and *depersonalizatio*n and low levels of *personal accomplishment*.	Mismatch in all six areas
Engagement	High levels of energy, feel a connection to their work and feel successful	Good match in all six areas
Overextended	Frequent exhaustion but do not have a high level of depersonalization and continue to experience personal accomplishment	Mismatch in *workload*
Disengaged	Not feeling exhaustion and may feel they are cynical and have lost their motivation	Mismatch in all areas except *workload*
Ineffective	Decreased *personal accomplishment* due to not feeling successful on not feeling connected to the work	Does not have a strong match or mismatch in any area

Note. Description of profiles and approximate percentage of workforce from Maslach & Leiter, 2022, pp. 53-58.

The MBI results from the special education administrators in this study seem to indicate that they align most closely with the *overextended* profile. While they may feel emotionally exhausted a few times a month, they only experience depersonalization a few times a year to once a month or less and feel personal accomplishment once a week to a few times a week. This highlights the positive aspects of the profession where most special education administrators are

not experiencing high levels of depersonalization and still feel a sense of personal accomplishment. These findings provide hope that lessening some of the demands for special education administrators could decrease their levels of *emotional exhaustion* and significantly improve their perceptions of work.

Open-Ended Responses

Participants were given the opportunity to share any additional insights or feedback with the prompt, “Do you have any additional comments or thoughts related to special education administrator burnout, engagement or job-person fit that you would like to share?” Participants' feedback varied. Many comments related to what participants attribute to be the causes or factors leading to burnout and how to reduce burnout. Approximately 30% of the responses were related to staffing, including difficulties with recruitment, hiring and retention of qualified staff members. Similar responses were indicated in research by Luckner and Movahedazarhouligh (2019), who found that, “The primary challenges identified by the directors of special education relate to the issue of personnel (i.e., hiring, retaining, evaluating, supervising, and providing PD)” (p. 107). The consistent and growing shortage of qualified special education staff negatively impacts teachers, students and administrators (Billingsley & Bettini, 2019). Lashley and Boscardin (2003) also identified staffing issues as a significant challenge for special education administrators: “Retaining certified and qualified personnel in special education is the ultimate challenge for special education administrators. Their roles in supporting and developing the special education work force involve the recruitment, retention, and professional development of special education teachers and related services professionals” (p. 14). It seems likely that the time and effort involved in staffing are contributors to the *emotional exhaustion* of

special education administrators. The high percentage of open-ended responses in this study that focus on the challenges of staffing supports the ramifications that continual hiring and staff training place on special education administrators.

Limitations

"Study limitations represent weaknesses within a research design that may influence outcomes and conclusions of the research" (Ross & Bibler Zaidi, 2019, p.261). Some limitations of this study are listed below.

1. This study is a cross-sectional survey. The results cannot be used to determine causation but merely correlation.
2. This study was conducted in the fall of 2023. The time of year likely impacts participants' responses, as different stressors are present depending on the time of year.
3. Survey responses represent the views of active members of the Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) organization. While the MASE membership spans geographically across the state and includes administrators in a variety of positions with various years of experience, individuals who are members of MASE may hold different views burnout and job-person fit than other Minnesota special education administrators.
4. The results of this study cannot be generalized to special education administrators outside of the state, nor to general education administrators.
5. The disaggregated data based on years in special education needs to be interpreted with caution. The age of participants was not collected, and it is possible that

individuals with similar years of experience in special education could also share common stressors related to their age that are not related to their years in special education administration.

Recommendations for Practice

1. School districts should assess the workload of their current special education administrators. If the workload is not manageable and requires individuals to consistently work outside of their scheduled hours, *emotional exhaustion* is likely and could lead to increased special education administrator attrition. Organizations should hire enough special education administrators for the work required. They should evaluate staffing levels often based on the increased demands that are emerging in educational administration. Superintendents and other district leaders should encourage special education administrators to create and maintain appropriate boundaries between work and home.
2. Administrators in this study report the highest degree of match within values. The questions in the *values* subscale of the AWS focus on the degree that the individual's goals and values are like the organizations and whether they feel the organization they work for is committed to quality. Organizations can capitalize on the values match by having administrators identify their purpose and showing them how it aligns with the organization and their daily work. They can highlight that even when dealing with difficult and emotionally taxing situations, if administrators act within their values, they can experience the benefits of meaningful and fulfilling work: "Most employees do their best work when they believe in what they are doing, and their

daily work nourishes their integrity, pride, and self-respect" (Maslach & Leiter, 2022, pp. 25-26).

3. Caring deeply for the people they serve; special education administrators may spend significant time and energy on their work which could lead to *emotional exhaustion*. The administrators in this study report *emotional exhaustion* a few times a month. Special education administrators should set clear boundaries with work, so they can continue to work at a high level without driving themselves to exhaustion. If special education administrators begin experiencing *emotional exhaustion* more frequently it could lead to the development of the other burnout symptoms (i.e., depersonalization and decreased personal accomplishment). Additionally, special education administrators should model healthy work boundaries for the special education staff they work with.

   "As leaders, we are so prone to burnout. We often feel pressured to move constantly at breakneck speed…Yet, if we want to protect our employees from burnout, we had better start modeling the behaviors we want to see in others. Employees can't be what they can't see." (Moss, 2021, p. 32)

   If special education administrators model healthier work habits, they give permission for others to take care of themselves as well. If special education staff can avoid or reduce their degree of burned out, teacher retention and support for students could improve.

4. Special education administrators should lean into the personal accomplishment and efficacy they feel in their positions. Often there are factors such as lack of funding,

staffing and the mental health crisis that are outside of their control but working on what is in their circle of influence can improve their work engagement and retention in the field.

Recommendations for Further Research

"The important question is not "what is related to burnout?" That is already well known. Rather, the question should be "Of all the things related to burnout, what should change?" (Maslach & Leiter, 2022, p. 183). Based on the results of this study, the following recommendations for future research are listed below:

1. Conduct additional research on special education administrator burnout. Research should focus on how to support and train administrators to improve their work engagement, decrease their burnout, and improve the health of the organization (Wigert, 2020).
2. The data from this study showed a correlation between the AWS scale of *workload* and the MBI-ES scale of *emotional exhaustion*. Applied research should be conducted to find ways to reduce special education administrator workload.
3. While identifying ways to reduce burnout is important, the goal should not be only avoidance of burnout, but rather fostering work engagement (Schaufeli et al., 2009). Future qualitative research interviewing special education administrators with high work engagement could provide more detailed suggestions for improving work engagement.
4. The special education administrators sampled in this study varied across position type, district type and years in administration, as well as years in their current

position. Trends in the data appear to indicate that special education administrators in intermediate district appear to have a better job-person match and that administrators in charter schools have decreased burnout but also decreased job-person match. More research is needed to understand the differences in these district types and how they may impact engagement and burnout.

5. In reviewing the demographics of this sample, 15.88% have been in their current district 0-2 years compared to 26.29% who have been in special education administration 0-2 years. More detailed information about the reason for the shift in the district could be helpful for identifying strategies to reduce special education administrator turnover.

References

Abbott, M. L., & McKinney, J. (2013). *Understanding and applying research design*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc ©. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118647325

Abrams, S. (2023). *Special education funding gap would disappear under massive spending proposal*. Minnesota House of Representatives. https://www.house.mn.gov/sessiondaily/Story/17585#:~:text=Every%20school%20district%20in%20Minnesota,into%20their%20general%20education%20funds.

Alessani, G., Perinelli, E., De Longis, E., Schaufeli, W. B., Theodorou, A., Borgogni, L., … & Work and Organizational Psychology: Occupational Health Psychology. (2018). Job burnout: The contribution of emotional stability and emotional self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *91*(4), 823–851. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12225

Aloe, A. M., Amo, L. C., & Shanahan, M. E. (2014). Classroom management self-efficacy and burnout: A multivariate meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, *26*(1), 101–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-013-9244-0

Arens, A. K., & Morin, A. J. S. (2016). Relations between teachers' emotional exhaustion and students' educational outcomes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 108,* 800–813. http://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000105

Bakker, A., Demerouti, E., & Schaufeli, W. (2002). Validation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory -general survey: An internet study. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, *15*(3), 245–260.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* W H Freeman/Times Books/ Henry Holt & Co.

Bartanen, B., Grissom, J. A., & Rogers, L. K. (2019). The impacts of principal turnover. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *41*(3), 350–374. https://doi.org/10.3102/0162373719855044

Begley, D. M. (1982). Burnout among special education administrators. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, *24*(2), 1–25.

Berry, A. B. (2012). The relationship of perceived support to satisfaction and commitment for special education teachers in rural areas. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, *31*(1), 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/875687051203100102

Billingsley, B., & Bettini, E. (2019). Special education teacher attrition and retention: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *89*(5), 697–744. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654319862495

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research, 78*(3), 367–409. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308321455

Boujut, E., Popa-Roch, M., Palomares, E.-A., Dean, A., & Cappe, E. (2017). Self-efficacy and burnout in teachers of students with autism spectrum disorder. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, *36*, 8–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rasd.2017.01.002

Bozkuş, K. (2021). A systematic review of studies on classroom management from 1980 to 2019. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, *13*(4).

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*(2), 239–253. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(99)00057-8

Brudnik, M. (2009). Perception of self-efficacy and professional burnout in general education teachers. *Human Movement*, *10*(2), 170–175. https://doi.org/10.2478/v10038-009-0013-3

Brunsting, N. C., Sreckovic, M. A., & Lane, K. L. (2014). Special education teacher burnout: A synthesis of research from 1979 to 2013. *Education & Treatment of Children*, *37*(4), 681–711. https://doi.org/10.1353/etc.2014.0032

Byrne, B. M. (1993). The Maslach Burnout Inventory: Testing for factorial validity and invariance across elementary, intermediate and secondary teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *66*(3), 197–212. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1993.tb00532.x

Carter, S. J. (2011). Burnout among special education administrators: A preliminary study. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, *24*(2), 104–110.

DeMatthews, D., Carrola, P., Reyes, P., & Knight, D. (2021). School leadership burnout and job-related stress: Recommendations for district administrators and principals. *The Clearing House*, *94*(4), 159–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2021.1894083

DeMatthews, D. E., Knight, D. S., & Shin, J. (2022). The principal-teacher churn: Understanding the relationship between leadership turnover and teacher attrition. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *58*(1), 76–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X211051974

Dilberti, M. K., & Schwartz, H. L. (2023). Educator turnover has markedly increased but districts have taken action to boost teacher ranks. Selected findings from the sixth American school district panel survey. https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RRA900/RRA956-14/RAND_RRA956-14.pdf

Edmonson, S. (2001, February 16-18). *Burnout among special education administrators*. [Conference session] Annual Conference of the American Association of School Administrators in conjunction with the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Orlando, FL, United States.

Egyed, C. J., & Short, R. J. (2006). Teacher self-efficacy, burnout, experience and decision to refer a disruptive student. *School Psychology International*, *27*(4), 462–474. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034306070432

Ferris, D. L., & Ruff, W. G. (2011). *Blazing new trails: Preparing leaders to improve access [Special education director burnout in Montana]* (pp. 81-92). Proactive Publications.

Field, J. (2019) *Teacher burnout and student outcomes: Is there a link and are student-teacher relationships a predictor?* (Doctoral thesis), University of Southampton.

Fore, C., Martin, C., & Bender, W. N. (2002). Teacher burnout in special education: The causes and the recommended solutions. *The High School Journal*, *86*(1), 36–44. https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2002.0017

Friedman, I. A., & Farber, B. A. (1992). Professional self-concept as a predictor of teacher burnout. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *86*(1), 28–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1992.9941824

Fulton, B. R. (2018). Organizations and survey research: Implementing response enhancing strategies and conducting nonresponse analyses. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *47*(2), 240–276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124115626169

Genoud, P. A., & Waroux, E. L. (2021). The impact of negative affectivity on teacher burnout. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(24), 13124–. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182413124

Gmelch, W. H., & Gates, G. (1998). The impact of personal, professional and organizational characteristics on administrator burnout. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *36*(2), 146–159. https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239810204363

Goldhaber, D., & Theobald, R. (2022). Teacher attrition and mobility over time. *Educational Researcher*, *51*(3), 235–237. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X211060840

Hakanen, J. J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, *43*(6), 495–513. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.11.001

Heale, R., & Noble, H. (2019). Integration of a theoretical framework into your research study. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, *22*(2), 36–37. https://doi.org/10.1136/ebnurs-2019-103077

Herman, K. C., Hickmon-Rosa, J., & Reinke, W. M. (2018). Empirically derived profiles of teacher stress, burnout, self-efficacy, and coping and associated student outcomes. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, *20*(2), 90–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/1098300717732066

Hopman, J. A. B., Tick, N. T., van der Ende, J., Wubbels, T., Verhulst, F. C., Maras, A., … & van Lier, P. A. C. (2018). Special education teachers' relationships with students and self-efficacy moderate associations between classroom-level disruptive behaviors and emotional exhaustion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *75*, 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.06.004

Hussey, W. J., Thomas, S. H., Anderson, K., & Algozzine, B. (2019). A survey of responsibilities, workload, and satisfaction of administrators of special education. *Journal of Special Education Leadership, 32*(2), 117–128.

Iwanicki, E. F., & Schwab, R. L. (1981). A cross validation study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 41*(4), 1167–1174.

Jarzynkowski, P., Piotrkowska, R., Mędrzycka-Dąbrowska, W., & Książek, J. (2021). Areas of work fife as predictors of occupational burnout of nurses and doctors in operating theaters in Poland-Multicenter studies. *Healthcare, 10*(1), 26-37. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10010026

Jimenez, P., & Dunkl, A. (2017). The buffering effect of workplace resources on the relationship between the areas of worklife and burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 12–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00012

Kyriakides, L., Christoforou, C., & Charalambous, C. Y. (2013). What matters for student learning outcomes: A meta-analysis of studies exploring factors of effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 36*, 143–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.07.010

Lashley, C., & Boscardin, M. L. (2003). *Special education administration at a crossroads: Availability, licensure, and preparation of special education administrators*. (COPSSE Document No. IB-8). Center on Personnel Studies in Special Education.

Lauermann, F., & König, J. (2016). Teachers' professional competence and wellbeing: Understanding the links between general pedagogical knowledge, self-efficacy and

burnout. *Learning and Instruction*, *45*, 9–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.06.006

Lazarides, R., Watt, H. M. G., & Richardson, P. W. (2020). Teachers' classroom management self-efficacy, perceived classroom management and teaching contexts from beginning until mid-career. *Learning and Instruction, 69*, Article 101346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2020.101346

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (1999). Six areas of worklife: A model of the organizational context of burnout. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 21*(4), 472–489.

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2000, 2011). Areas of worklife survey. *Mind Garden, Inc.* © Retrieved from www.mindgarden.com

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2003), Areas of worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of job burnout. *Emotional and Physiological Processes and Positive Intervention Strategies, 3*, 91-134. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555(03)03003-8

Leiter, M. P. & Maslach, C. (2005). A mediation model of job burnout. *Research Companion to Organizational Health Psychology*, pp. 544-564.

Leiter, M. P. & Maslach, C. (2011). *Areas of worklife survey manual* (5th ed.). Mind Garden, Inc. ©

Luckner, J. L., & Movahedazarhouligh, S. (2019). Leadership in special education: Administrators' current challenges in one western state. *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, *32*(2), 103-116.

Lynham, S. A. (2002). The general method of theory-building research in applied disciplines. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *4*(3), 221–241. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422302043002

Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021a). Does teacher burnout affect students? A systematic review of its association with academic achievement and student-reported outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *105*, p.1-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101714

Madigan, D. J., & Kim, L. E. (2021b). Towards an understanding of teacher attrition: A meta-analysis of burnout, job satisfaction, and teachers' intentions to quit. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *105*, Article 103425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103425

Malinen, O.-P., & Savolainen, H. (2016). The effect of perceived school climate and teacher efficacy in behavior management on job satisfaction and burnout: A longitudinal study. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *60*, 144–152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.08.012

Marken, S., & Agrawal, S. (2022). K-12 workers have the highest burnout rate in the U.S. Gallup. https://news.gallup.com/poll/393500/workers-highest-burnout-rate.aspx

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, *2*(2), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. (1996-2018). *Maslach Burnout Inventory manual*. Mind Garden, Inc. ©

Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Schwab, R. L. (1986). *Maslach Burnout Inventory—educator survey*. Mind Garden, Inc. ©

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2005). Reversing burnout: How to rekindle your passion for your work. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, *3*(4), 42–49.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2017). Understanding burnout. *The Handbook of Stress and Health*, *pp.* 36–56. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118993811.ch3

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2022). *The burnout challenge: Managing people's relationships with their jobs*. Harvard University Press.

Maslach, C., Leiter, M. P., & Jackson, S. E. (2012). Making a significant difference with burnout interventions: Researcher and practitioner collaboration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *33*(2), 296–300. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.784

Miller, M. D., Brownell, M. T., & Smith, S. W. (1999). Factors that predict teachers staying in, leaving, or transferring from the special education classroom. *Exceptional Children*. *65*(2), 201-208. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440299906500206

Mitchell, B. S., Hirn, R. G., & Lewis, T. J. (2017). Enhancing effective classroom management in schools: Structures for changing teacher behavior. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, *40*, 140–153. DOI:10.1177/0888406417700961

Moss, J. (2021). *The burnout epidemic: The rise of chronic stress and how we can fix it.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2022a). *Schools and staffing survey. 2015-2016 and 2020-2021*. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d22/tables/dt22_210.60.asp

National Center for Education Statistics. (2022b). Students with disabilities. *Condition of Education.* U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cgg

Palma-Vasquez, C., Carrasco, D., & Tapia-Ladino, M. (2022). Teacher mobility: What is it, how is it measured and what factors determine it? A Scoping Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *19*(4), 2313. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042313

Park, E.-Y., & Shin, M. (2020). A meta-analysis of special education teachers' burnout. *SAGE Open, 10*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020918297

Pietarian, J., Pyhältö, K., Soini, T., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). Reducing teacher burnout: A socio-contextual approach. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 35*, 62–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.05.003

Player, D., Youngs, P., Perrone, F., & Grogan, E. (2017). How principal leadership and person-job fit are associated with teacher mobility and attrition. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *67*, 330–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.017

Roberts, C., & Hyatt, L. (2019). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation* (3rd ed.). Corwin.

Robinson, J. (2022). The antidote to manager burnout. Gallup. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/389057/antidote-manager-burnout.aspx

Ross, P. T. & Bibler Zaidi, N. L. (2019). Limited by our limitations. 261-264. DOI: 10.1007/S40037-019-00530-X

Russell, M. B., Attoh, P. A., Chase, T., Gong, T., Kim, J., & Liggans, G. L. (2020). Examining burnout and the relationships between job characteristics, engagement, and turnover intention among U.S. educators. *SAGE Open*, *10*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020972361

Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Burnout: A short socio-cultural history. *Burnout, Fatigue, Exhaustion*, pp. 105-127.

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2009). Burnout: 35 years of research and practice. *Career Development International*, *14*(3), 204–220. https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430910966406

Schonlau, M., Fricker, R. D., & Elliot, M. N. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via e-mail and the web*. RAND Corporation. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7249/mr1480rc

Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2002). The development of academic self-efficacy. In A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles (Eds.), *Development of achievement motivation* (pp. 15-31). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012750053-9/50003-6

Schwarzer, R., & Hallum, S. (2008). Perceived teacher self-efficacy as a predictor of job stress and burnout: Mediation analyses. *Applied Psychology*, *57*, 152–171. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00359.x

Shoji, k., Cieslak, R., Smoktunowicz, E., Rogala, A., Benight, C. C., & Luszczynska, A. (2016). Associations between job burnout and self-efficacy: a meta-analysis. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping*, *29*(4), 367–386. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2015.1058369

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2009). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*(4), 1059–1069. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001

Slišković, A., Burić, I., & Sorić, I. (2019). The relations between principal support and work engagement and burnout: Testing the role of teachers' emotions and educational level. *Work*, *64*(2), 203–215. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-192987

Spinelli, W. M., Fernstrom, K. M., Galos, D. L., & Britt, H. R. (2016). Extending our understanding of burnout and its associated factors: providers and staff in primary care clinics. *Evaluation of Health Professionals*, *39*(3), 282-298. doi: 10.1177/0163278716637900. Epub 2016 Mar 21. PMID: 27000131

State of Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes. (2020). *Minnesota administrative rules. Program requirements for all administrative licenses*. Retrieved June 8, 2023, from https://www.revisor.mn.gov/rules/3512.0510/

Streiner, D. L., & Kottner, J. (2014). Recommendations for reporting the results of studies of instrument and scale development and testing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 70(9), 1970–1979. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12402

Szigeti, R., Balázs, N., Bikfalvi, R., & Urbán, R. (2017). Burnout and depressive symptoms in teachers: Factor structure and construct validity of the Maslach Burnout Inventory-educators survey among elementary and secondary school teachers in Hungary. *Stress and Health*, *33*(5), 530–539. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2737

Tschannen-Moran, M., Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*(2), 202–248. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543068002202

Tschannen-Moran, M., & McMaster, P. (2009). Sources of self-efficacy: Four professional development formats and their relationship to self-efficacy and implementation of a new teaching strategy. *The Elementary School Journal*, *110*(2), 228–245. https://doi.org/10.1086/605771

UCLA. (2021). *What does Cronbach alpha mean?* SPSS FAQ. https://stats.oarc.ucla.edu/spss/faq/what-does-cronbachs-alpha-mean/

Wang, H., Hall, N. C., & Rahimi, S. (2015). Self-efficacy and causal attributions in teachers: Effects on burnout, job satisfaction, illness, and quitting intentions. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *47*, 120–130. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.12.005

Weißenfels, M., Benick, M., & Perels, F. (2021). Can teacher self-efficacy act as a buffer against burnout in inclusive classrooms? *International Journal of Educational Research*, *109*, 101794. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101794

Wheeler, D. L., Vassar, M., Worley, J. A., & Barnes, L. L. B. (2011). A reliability generalization meta-analysis of coefficient alpha for the Maslach Burnout Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *71*(1), 231–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164410391579

Wigert, B. (2020). *Employee burnout: The biggest myth.* Gallup. https://www.gallup.com/workplace/288539/employee-burnout-biggest-myth.aspx

Wong, V. W., Ruble, L. A., Yu, Y., & McGrew, J. H. (2017). Too stressed to teach? Teaching quality, student engagement, and IEP outcomes. *Exceptional Children*, *83*(4), 412–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402917690729

World Health Organization. (2019). Burn-out an "occupational phenomenon": *International classification of diseases*. https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases

Yu, X., Wang, P., Zhai, X., Dai, H., & Yang, Q. (2015). The effect of work stress on job burnout among teachers: The mediating role of self-efficacy. *Social Indicators Research*, *122*(3), 701–708. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0716-5

Zee, M., de Jong, P. F., & Koomen, H. M. Y. (2017). From externalizing student behavior to student-specific teacher self-efficacy: The role of teacher-perceived conflict and closeness in the student–teacher relationship. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *51*, 37–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2017.06.009

Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment, and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 981–1015. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801

Zhao, X., Wu, K., Sun, B., & Li, W. (2022). Teacher career calling reduces burnout: The mediation effects of work engagement and psychological capital. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 988467–988467. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.988467

Appendix A

Maslach Burnout Inventory Survey Permission

Permission Letter

mind garden

www.mindgarden.com

To Whom It May Concern,

The above-named person has made a license purchase from Mind Garden, Inc. and has permission to administer the following copyrighted instrument up to that quantity purchased:

Maslach Burnout Inventory forms: Human Services Survey, Human Services Survey for Medical Personnel, Educators Survey, General Survey, or General Survey for Students.

The license holder has permission to administer the complete instrument in their research, however, only three sample items from this instrument as specified below may be included in the research write-up, thesis, or dissertation. Any other use must receive prior written permission from Mind Garden. The entire instrument form may not be included or reproduced at any time in any other published material. Please understand that disclosing more than we have authorized will compromise the integrity and value of the test.

Citation of the instrument must include the applicable copyright statement listed below.
Sample Items:

MBI - Human Services Survey - MBI-HSS:
I feel emotionally drained from my work.
I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
I don't really care what happens to some recipients.

MBI - Human Services Survey for Medical Personnel - MBI-HSS (MP):
I feel emotionally drained from my work.
I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
I don't really care what happens to some patients.

MBI - Educators Survey - MBI-ES:
I feel emotionally drained from my work.
I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
I don't really care what happens to some students.

Cont'd on next page

MBI - General Survey - MBI-GS:
I feel emotionally drained from my work.
In my opinion, I am good at my job.
I doubt the significance of my work.

MBI - General Survey for Students - MBI-GS (S):
I feel emotionally drained by my studies.
In my opinion, I am a good student.
I doubt the significance of my studies.

Sincerely,

Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

Appendix B

Areas of Worklife Survey Permission

Permission Letter

mind garden

www.mindgarden.com

To Whom It May Concern,

The above-named person has made a license purchase from Mind Garden, Inc. and has permission to administer the following copyrighted instrument up to that quantity purchased:

Areas of Worklife Survey

The license holder has permission to administer the complete instrument in their research, however, only six sample items from this instrument as specified below may be included in the research write-up, thesis, or dissertation. Any other use must receive prior written permission from Mind Garden. The entire instrument form may not be included or reproduced at any time in any other published material. Please understand that disclosing more than we have authorized will compromise the integrity and value of the test.

Citation of the instrument must include the applicable copyright statement listed below.

Sample Items:

I do not have time to do the work that must be done.
I have control over how I do my work.
I receive recognition from others for my work.
Members of my work group communicate openly.
Resources are allocated fairly here.
My values and the Organization's values are alike.

Sincerely,

Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

Appendix C

Institutional Review Board Approval

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB)
720 4th Avenue South AS 101, St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498

September 27, 2023

Angela Lauderbaugh
Email: angela.lauderbaugh@go.stcloudstate.edu

Faculty Mentor: Frances Kayona

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed your protocol to conduct research involving human subjects.

Project Title: The Association Between Minnesota Special Education Administrators' Job Burnout and Job-Person Fit

Your project has been: Approved

IRB PROTOCOL DETERMINATION: Exempt

SCSU IRB#: 54640173

Please read through the following important information concerning IRB projects .

- The principal investigator assumes the responsibilities for the protection of participants in this project. Any adverse events must be reported to the IRB as soon as possible (ex. research related injuries, harmful outcomes, significant withdrawal of subject population, etc.).
- The principal investigator must seek approval for any changes to the study (ex. research design, consent process, survey/interview instruments, funding source, etc) by completing an IRB Modification/RevisionequestForm:https://webportalapp.com/webform/irb_modification_request_form
- The IRB reserves the right to review the research at any time.

Feel free to contact the IRB for assistance at 320-308-4932 or email ResearchNow@stcloudstate.edu and reference the SCSU IRB number when corresponding for expedited response. Additional information can be found on the IRB website https://www.stcloudstate.edu/irb/default.aspx.

Sincerely,
IRB Chair:
William Collis-Prather
Program Director
Applied Clinical Research

IRB Institutional Official:
Dr. Claudia Tomany
Associate Provost for Research
Dean of Graduate Studies

Appendix D

Letter of Cooperation from MASE

ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY

Educational Leadership and Higher Education
720 4th Ave S, St. Cloud, MN 56301-4498
T 320.308.4220
stcloudstate.edu/elhe

Date: 09/05/2023

To: St. Cloud State Institutional Review Board

From: Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE)

Re: Permission to Conduct Study

The Minnesota Administrators for Special Education (MASE) organization has agreed to allow Angela Lauderbaugh to survey and collect data from active MASE members for her Doctoral dissertation study on burnout and job-person fit. Please consider this a letter of cooperation and approval.

Respectfully,

Erin A. Toninato

Erin Toninato
MASE Executive Director

Appendix E

Study Recruitment Video Script

Hello, my name is Angie Lauderbaugh. I am an active MASE member and a special education supervisor for Meeker and Wright Special Education Cooperative serving Delano Public Schools. Currently, I am also pursuing my Educational Administration and Leadership Doctorate through St. Cloud State University. My research will be focused on Minnesota special education administrators' perceived levels of burnout and engagement using a job-related attitudes and job-person fit questionnaire.

The special education administrator role is high pressured and demanding. I am acutely aware of the many competing requests of your time and have constructed a concise yet informative questionnaire. I am optimistic that many of you will choose to complete the survey because I think it is time that special education administrator's burnout and engagement is studied. Special education administrators have important and essential roles and are needed to advocate for and support special education staff and students. If special education administrator's well-being is not prioritized, we risk losing great special education administrators which could negatively impact special education staff retention and ultimately our students receiving special education services.

The week of October 16th, MASE has agreed to send active MASE members the research study questionnaire. Please watch your email for the questionnaire and consider participating. Your participation is voluntary, and your responses will remain confidential. I would like maximal participation so that the data gathered will be representative of Minnesota special education administrators and hopefully uncover trends and provide insight for how to reduce special education administrator burnout. I plan to apply and hope to present these findings at a future MASE conference.

I greatly appreciate your time and consideration!

Angie Lauderbaugh

Appendix F

Implied Consent

The Association Between Minnesota Special Education Administrators' Job Burnout and Job-Person Fit

Implied Consent

You are invited to participate in a research study about Minnesota Special Education Administrators' perceived levels of burnout and engagement using a job-related attitudes and job-person fit questionnaire. You were selected as a participant because you are an active member of Minnesota Administrators for Special Education, currently serving in a special education administrator role. This research is being conducted by Angie Lauderbaugh, as part of a doctoral dissertation in the Educational Administration and Leadership program through St. Cloud State University.

Background Information and Purpose
Special education administrators are responsible for supporting and advocating for students with disabilities. That responsibility makes the role of a special education administrator challenging and demanding. Minimal research, however, has been conducted on special education administrator's burnout and engagement. The purpose of this study is to examine special education administrator burnout and engagement and uncover any trends that may help support these professionals.

Benefits of the research
You will likely receive no direct benefit from participating in this research however, it is hoped that exploring special education administrator burnout and engagement through a job-person fit lens will provide insights for how to reduce administrator burnout. Reducing special education administrator burnout could lead to improved well-being and increased retention of special education administrators. It is also suspected that when special education administrators are engaged, they can provide better support for special education staff which could improve education and care for special education students.

Procedures
The questionnaire consists of 55 items and completion will take approximately 15-20 minutes. This online questionnaire utilizes personalized links for each participant to allow individual reminders to be sent.

Risks of the research
There are no foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study.

Confidentiality
Participants' names, identifying information and survey responses will remain confidential and will be deleted after completion of the study. Survey data will be housed in a password protected account in Qualtrics, on a password protected computer that is secured in a locked office. Results will not be shared until the conclusion of the study. The results will be shared in aggregate, not indicating participant identity.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal
Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision whether to participate will not affect your current or future relations with St. Cloud State University, or the researcher. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Contact Information
If you have questions about this research study, you may contact the researcher at amlauderbaugh@stcloudstate.edu, or the advisor, Frances Kayona, at 320-308-3170 or

fakayona@stcloudstate.edu.

Research Results
Results of the study can be requested from the researcher or viewed once published via the St. Cloud State University Repository.

Consent to Participate
Your completion of the questionnaire indicates that you are at least 18 years of age and your consent to participate in the study.

Appendix G

Initial Invitation to Participate in Survey

Hello,

My name is Angie Lauderbaugh. I am an active MASE member and a special education supervisor for Meeker and Wright Special Education Cooperative serving Delano Public Schools. Currently, I am also pursuing my Educational Administration and Leadership Doctorate through St. Cloud State University. My research is focused on Minnesota special education administrators' perceived levels of burnout and engagement.

You are receiving this email because you are an active member of Minnesota Administrators for Special Education, currently serving in a special education administrator role. I am acutely aware of the many competing requests of your time and have constructed a concise yet informative questionnaire. I am optimistic that many of you will choose to complete the survey because I think it is time that special education administrator's burnout and engagement is studied.

Your participation is voluntary and your responses will remain confidential. More information about the study can be reviewed in the informed consent.

Here is the link to participate [LINK], if you so choose.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Angie Lauderbaugh

Appendix H

Final Request to Participate in Survey

Message for those who have started but not finish the survey:

Hello,

My name is Angie Lauderbaugh. I am an active MASE member and a special education supervisor for Meeker and Wright Special Education Cooperative serving Delano Public Schools. Currently, I am also pursuing my Educational Administration and Leadership Doctorate through St. Cloud State University. My research is focused on Minnesota special education administrators' perceived levels of burnout and engagement.

My apologies for the second email. I want to thank you for starting the survey and ask you to consider completing the questionnaire. My hope is to have data that is representative of as many special education administrator's experiences as possible.

Your participation is voluntary and your responses will remain confidential. More information about the study can be reviewed in the informed consent.

Here is the link to participate [LINK], if you so choose.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Angie Lauderbaugh

Message for those who haven't taken the survey:
Hello,

My name is Angie Lauderbaugh. I am an active MASE member and a special education supervisor for Meeker and Wright Special Education Cooperative serving Delano Public Schools. Currently, I am also pursuing my Educational Administration and Leadership Doctorate through St. Cloud State University. My research is focused on Minnesota special education administrators' perceived levels of burnout and engagement.

My apologies for the second email but I am hoping you will consider completing the survey below, so the data is representative of as many special education administrator's experiences as possible.

Your participation is voluntary and your responses will remain confidential. More information about the study can be reviewed in the informed consent.

Here is the link to participate [LINK], if you so choose.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Angie Lauderbaugh

Appendix I

Sample Survey Questions

Special Education Administrator Job Attitudes Questionnaire

Section One- Demographic Questions:

1. What special education administrator role most closely aligns with your position?
    a. Executive Director or Director of Special Education
    b. Assistant Director
    c. Special Education Supervisor, Manager, or Coordinator
    d. Other special education administrator position
2. How long have you worked in a special education administrator role?
    a. 0-2 years
    b. 3-5 years
    c. 6-10 years
    d. 11-15 years
    e. 15+ years
3. How long have you worked in your current school district?
    a. 0-2 years
    b. 3-5 years
    c. 6-10 years
    d. 11-15 years
    e. 15+ years
4. What type of district are you employed in?
    a. Single education district
    b. Special education cooperative
    c. Intermediate district
    d. Charter School

Section Two- Job-Related Attitudes:

Note. adapted from The Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (Maslach et al., 1986).

Instructions: Listed below are 22 statements about job-related feelings. The aim of this questionnaire is to uncover how special education administrators feel about their job and the students and staff they work with. Read the statements below and rate how often you have experienced that feeling in your current special education administrator role. Indicate the frequency (from 1-6) that matches your experience with that statement. If you have never felt this way, select "0".

Copywrite Note: The researcher, Angela Lauderbaugh, has permission to from the publisher to administer the complete instrument for research but only three sample items from the questionnaire can be included in the dissertation write-up to maintain the integrity of the test (Maslach et al., 1986).

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

	How Often 0-6	**Statements:**
1.		I feel emotionally drained from my work.
15.		I don't really care what happens to some students or some of the educators that work in my district.
19.		I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.

Section Three- Areas of Worklife Survey:

Note. Questions from the Areas of Worklife Survey (Leiter & Maslach, 2011).

Instructions: Review the 28 statements below and indicate your level of agreement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Copywrite Note: The researcher, Angela Lauderbaugh, has permission to from the publisher to administer the complete instrument for research but only six sample items from the questionnaire can be included in the dissertation write-up to maintain the integrity of the test (Leiter & Maslach, 2011).

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Hard to Decide	Agree	Strongly Agree

Workload					
	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Hard to Decide	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I do not have the time to do the work that must be done.					
Control					
6. I have control over how I do my work.					
Reward					
10. I receive recognition from others for my work.					

Community					
17. Members of my work group communicate openly.					
Fairness					
19. Resources are allocated fairly here.					
Values					
25. My values and the Organization's values are alike					

Section Four- Open-Ended Comment:

55. Do you have any additional comments or thoughts related to special education administrator burnout, engagement or job-person fit that you would like to share?