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Problem

Few studies have addressed burnout among Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) clergy. Many SDA ministers report experiencing high stress in their ministries and they find it difficult to function optimally under these circumstances. Others experience serious complications that lead them to terminate their work as ministers.

Method

A quantitative research design was used for an ex post facto study of 130 pastors from the Pacific Union Conference. They completed two questionnaires: the Pastoral Services Demographic Data Sheet (PSDDS) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI).
Results

This study examined 12 variables and found that 10 variables had a significant relationship to at least one of the three subscales of the burnout inventory. Four clusters of variables were found that would lead one to be more prone to burnout. According to the study, 13.9% of the pastors in the study were experiencing average to high levels of burnout.

Conclusions

This study found the following for the Emotional Exhaustion subscale: 18 out of 130, or 13.9%, scored in the high degree of burnout range on Emotional Exhaustion; 34 out of 130, or 26.1%, scored in the average or moderate degree of burnout range; and 78 out of 130, or 60%, scored in the low range for burnout. The results for the Depersonalization subscale were as follows: 13 or 10% were in the high degree of the burnout range; 30 respondents or 23.1% were in the average or moderate range for burnout; and 87 or 67% were in the low range for burnout. The results for the Personal Accomplishment subscale, based only on low and high, found that 81 respondents or 62% scored in the low range for burnout and 49 or 38% scored in the high degree of burnout range.
In loving memory of my father, Pastor C. F. Edwards, and my mother, Mrs. Amie M. G. Edwards
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

Within the last few years there has been a great deal of interest exhibited in the question of stress and burnout in various career fields. There has been extensive study on the effects of this phenomenon in business and industry (Davey, 1995; Pappas, 1995; Pines, Aronson, & Kafry, 1981; Rassieur, 1982). The rationale for these studies arises from the need of businesses to obtain the most productive and brightest workers for their companies. Excellent performance from workers is a greatly sought-after goal. It is not just a matter of productivity, but of profitability. Since it is costly in business to train and groom employees to fill strategic and technical positions, it is important to explore ways to keep productive employees throughout their peak effective years. This is translated into more efficient use of training dollars and eventually more profit for the corporation.

The helping professions have also adopted a similar strategy for keeping experienced and valued employees longer. These workers bring experience and stability to their respective organizations. When employees are not able to function so as to produce optimal results, stress is blamed for reduced productivity. Too much stress can produce a condition that impedes the individual's ability to function at peak
efficiency. This condition is described, by some, as burnout (Freudenberger, 1977).

Burnout, a term first used by Freudenberger (1974) to describe the symptoms of emotional and physical exhaustion of persons working in alternative health-care institutions, appears to be a direct result of high levels of stress. Moracco (1981) defined burnout as an inadequate coping mechanism used consistently by an individual to reduce stress. According to Maslach (1976), the burned-out helping professional becomes unsympathetic and develops a cynical attitude toward his/her clients and their problems.

Others define burnout informally as a state of mind that frequently afflicts individuals who work with other people (especially, but not exclusively, in the helping professions) and who pour in much more than they get back from their clients, supervisors, and colleagues (Freudenburger, 1980). It is accompanied by an array of symptoms that include a general malaise; emotional, physical, and psychological fatigue; and feelings of helplessness, hopelessness, and a lack of enthusiasm about work and even about life in general (Demaray, 1983). It is insidious in that it usually does not occur as the result of one or two traumatic events, but sneaks up through a general erosion of the spirit.

Many studies suggest that mid-level executives are most likely to experience burnout in their profession. Rush (1989) says that society contributes much to the development of burnout in people, and that those on the way “up the ladder” will be most prone to overwork, unrealistic expectations, and role conflicts, which are all predictors of burnout.

Pines et al. (1981) suggest that people who are client-centered are candidates for
burnout. These are typically the mid-level management people who have not risen enough in their system’s organizational ladder to avoid people contact, and thus are more exposed to this predictor of burnout. They further state that people in these mid-level positions may seek relief by “quitting upward,” or moving up in their organization, in order to avoid contact with clients. Therefore a supervisor will interact with others who are often facing the same issues and will spend more time with management and paperwork than with people.

Clergy are in a stressful vocation. Although many serve faithfully and long in their calling, it is becoming more apparent that the professional ministry can be a heavily stressful vocation. The single most energy-draining pressure point among clergy is the gap between expectations and reality (Faulkner, 1981; Langford, 1998; Pennington, 1988). Pastors are often idealistic, especially when they first come out of the seminary. They are sure they can see the “sins and weaknesses” in the church and in individuals. They are sure that they have the “answers” to these problems in the Gospel in their sincere efforts to change things. Consequently, pastors often come up against the resistance of their congregations to their “wondrous” ideas (Figley, 1998; Grosch & Olsen, 2000).

Congregations often do not want to change, or they want to change by themselves, or they disagree as to what changes should occur. Pastors often struggle with the concept of how much to control the church vs. how much to guide a church along “the right” way. Bowers (1963), a New York psychiatrist and early observer of clergy in her psychiatric practice, found a curious and powerful characteristic in clergy. She called it
"exhibitionism." She proposed that clergy were very aware of and liked the attention and power of leadership, but seemed to be caught in the bind of not really knowing how to lead; of loving to be authoritative while worrying about being humble.

Dittes (1971) found a powerful factor in clergy stress, which he called "the little adult" syndrome. He suggested that clergy were overly serious and idealistic and often had been that way during much of their lives. He believed it was against their nature to be playful, relaxed, compromising, and spontaneous. They had difficulty relating to persons with more casual characteristics or to those who were as serious and intense as they were. He commented that it often seemed that clergy were born 21 years old, and it was as if they never got in enough sandpile-time when growing up.

Blizzard’s research (1956) suggested that pastors spent a large portion of their time doing administrative work. Although it is work for which they had little training, and from which they felt little reward, they often felt forced. They either had no one else to do it, or they were unwilling to delegate it. Hadden (1969) found an "identity crisis" among pastors. He saw this as a conflict between clergy and laity over authority, belief, and the mission of the church. All the above in some way contributed to the instances of burnout that the clergy may experience.

Biersdorf (1971) reported that clergy felt frustrated because the church did not respond to change the way the pastor felt it should. The pastor, thus, felt caught in an organization which should be responsive to change, and yet the church appeared to keep him or her from ministering to the changing needs in the congregation and community. Jud, Mills, and Burch (1970) found many typical stressors for clergy, such as feelings of
inadequacy, church politics, family pressures, and work frustrations. When these stressors accumulated, it seemed to take only one precipitating event to push a pastor into despair or to move him out of the parish ministry.

Mills (1971), whom some consider one of the most thorough investigators of clergy stress, found many sources of stress among clergy. Low salary, feelings of frustration and futility, feelings of inadequacy, spouse and family unhappiness with the church, and inability to relocate were just a few of the sources that he lists. One of Mills's most insightful findings was in the area of role conflicts. He found role pressures for pastors resulted from being the identified leader of society's chief valuing institution. The pastor had to deal constantly with polarities. His or her vocation was an ultimate commitment, with his or her church members as the employers. The minister's three identities, personal, professional, and religious, appeared to be locked into one role: that of the pastor. The differing expectations at work for the pastor from parishioners, the denomination, one's peers, and self, made it difficult for the pastor to prioritize his or her work in a satisfying way.

According to Rediger (1982), there are certain key moments in the pastor's life when the stress seems more severe, and therefore, more likely to lead to burnout. First, as young pastors, they are susceptible to burnout when they arrive at their first or second parish and are unable to adjust the zeal of their idealism and expectations to how much they can realistically change. Second, about 10 to 15 years into his or her career, when energy is less and idealistic zeal has been moderated, the pastor often feels a nagging question, "Is this the way I want to spend the rest of my professional life?" And then
about 10 to 5 years before retirement, a pastor may wonder with considerable anxiety whether his or her career is all downhill now or actually over.

There are three major areas that are associated with the burnout syndrome. These represent symptoms that are physically, emotionally, and spiritually observable. The physical symptoms include complaints of fatigue, weight loss or weight gain, sleep disturbances, psychomotor agitation or retardation, frequent headaches, gastric upset, changes in sexual drive, and hypochondriacal complaints. The emotional symptoms include apathy, obsessive thought patterns, loss of creativity, paranoia, irritability, constant worrying, loss of humor or development of dark humor, sporadic efforts to act as if everything is back to normal, complaints of loneliness, inability to be playful or become interested in diversionary activities, excessive crying, flight of ideas, trouble concentrating, and feelings of hopelessness (Golden, 2002; Maslach, 1978; Rediger, 1982; Woodburn, 1997/1998; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998).

The spiritual symptoms include significant changes in moral behavior, drastic changes in theological beliefs, cessation of prayer, and devotional habits (Coate, 1990; Pennington, 1988). There then appears a tendency toward more harsh moral judgments of themselves and others, loss of faith in God, the church, and themselves, and one-track preaching and teaching. Other symptoms are listless and perfunctory performance of clergy-role duties, loss of joy and celebration in spiritual endeavors, and cynicism (Rediger, 1982; Sewell & Sewell, 1997/1998).

Further studies are needed to study whether other variables, such as marital satisfaction, number of children, highest educational degree obtained, number of moves
made, time spent in the parish versus time spent at home, size of the congregation, and
descriptions held, are also contributing to burnout among the clergy.

**Statement of the Problem**

Few studies have addressed burnout among SDA clergy. More information is
needed about how these peculiarities among the SDA clergy affect their vulnerability to
professional burnout. One such study, by Pandjaitan (1999), reported that many Seventh-
day Adventist (SDA) ministers complain that they experience high stress in their
ministries and that they find it difficult to function optimally under these circumstances.
Such stress most likely has a negative effect on their productivity and on their influence
in their congregations. Others experience serious complications that lead them to
terminate their work as ministers (Pandjaitan, 1999).

Reinhold (1996) states that burnout happens when the stresses are too strong
and the rewards too few. Too much stress, overwork, unrealistic expectations, role
conflicts, and fatigue all take their toll on clergy (Pines et al., 1981). Recent studies
(Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Davey, 1995; Grosch & Olsen, 2000; Pines, 2000; Rediger,
1993; Wallstrom, 1990; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998) document clergy burnout. It has
been suggested that clergy in the SDA church are, in several ways, different from their
colleagues in other denominations: (a) they are employed exclusively by the church and
can have no other employment; (b) it is desirable that the SDA pastor be married, unlike
their Catholic colleagues; and (c) dietary, moral, and spiritual constraints are strict and
demand that SDA pastors abstain from gambling, drinking, smoking, wearing jewelry,
and indulging in other mundane pursuits (General Conference Working Policy, 1997).

**Purpose of the Study**

This study explored certain variables and assessed whether they contribute to pastoral burnout. It is hoped that the results of this study will enable the minister and his or her administrators to create interventions that might prevent or alleviate burnout. The purpose of this study was to determine (a) the burnout levels of pastors in the SDA denomination, and (b) the nature and the relationship, if any, among the following variables: Age, Spirituality, Years Married, Number of Children, Hours on the Job, Hours With the Family, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Members, Number of Moves, and Counseling (excluded variables included Gender, Marital Status, Highest Level of Education Completed, Primary Area of Work, Primary Position Held, Years of Pastoral Experience, and Ethnicity).

**Research Questions**

This research project examined the following questions:

1. Which of the 12 variables (Age, Spirituality, Years Married, Number of Children, Hours on the Job, Hours With the Family, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Members, Number of Moves, and Counseling) are related to burnout scores among SDA pastors?

2. Are there any clusters of variables that make one more prone to burnout?

3. Are SDA pastors significantly experiencing burnout?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the three burnout scales and the 12 independent variables used in this study?

5. Is the relationship between the 12 independent variables different for the three burnout scales?

**Theoretical Foundation**

Although this research draws from many notable theorists in the areas of stress and burnout, it dealt with three main theories or concepts: First, on Hans Selye’s research on stress; Second, on Christina Maslach’s work on burnout; and Third, on my own personal experience.

**Stress and Hans Selye**

The early use of the concept of "stress" is closely identified with the work of Hans Selye. He popularized the term and defined it in a general way as "the rate of all the wear and tear caused by life" (Selye, 1956, p. 551). In many studies over the course of almost 40 years, Selye described the impact of "stressors" on the responses of different organ systems of the body. He emphasized the connection between stress and disease in his "general adaptation syndrome." According to the general adaptation syndrome, the initial response to stress is called the alarm reaction. The alarm reaction is followed by a second stage, the adaptation or resistance stage, which includes the successful activation of the appropriate response systems and the reestablishment of homoeostatic balance. If stress is prolonged or frequently repeated, the second stage is followed by the third stage, exhaustion phase. The exhaustion phase sets in and is
characterized by an increased susceptibility to disease (Selye, 1956).

Selye (1991) discussed that whether stress is positive (eustress) or negative (distress), the body undergoes a wide variety of accompanying physiological changes. As mentioned above, the general adaptation syndrome is viewed as the totality of these physiological changes that describes the mobilization of the sympathetic nervous system (SNS). Whether you participate in the Ph.D. graduation ceremonies (eustress) or find yourself in a boating accident (distress), the SNS mobilization produces changes in the cardiovascular, hormonal, respiratory, and temperature systems of the body (Stevens-Long & Commons, 1992; Wilder & Plutchik, 1985). His work influences how the concept of stress is viewed in this study.

**Burnout and Christina Maslach**

According to Maslach (1982b), burnout is a reaction to work-related stress. It involves emotional exhaustion, a feeling of being unable to accomplish anything on the job, a sense of helplessness, and a loss of control. It is especially common among people in the helping professions (like teachers, doctors, therapists, social workers, ministers, and police) who feel frustrated by their inability to help as many people as they would like. Burnout is usually a response to long-term stress rather than an immediate crisis, with symptoms such as fatigue, insomnia, headaches, persistent colds, stomach troubles, alcohol or drug abuse, and trouble getting along with people. A burned-out worker may quit a job suddenly, pull away from family and friends, and sink into depression (Maslach & Jackson, 1985).
Maslach and Leiter (1997) state that the conventional wisdom is that burnout is primarily a problem of the individual. That is, people burn out because of flaws in their character, behavior, or productivity. According to this perspective, people are the problem, and the solution is to change them or get rid of them. Maslach and Leiter (1997) felt that, based on their research, they must argue most emphatically that this is not so. Maslach and Leiter (1997) state, “As a result of extensive study, we believe that burnout is not a problem of the people themselves but of the social environment in which people work” (p. 18). The structure and functioning of the workplace shape how people interact with one another and how they carry out their jobs. When the workplace does not recognize the human side of work, then the risk of burnout grows and carries with it a high price.

Each person expresses burnout in a unique way, but the basic themes are the same. First, an erosion of engagement with the job occurs. What started out as important, meaningful, and fascinating work becomes unpleasant, unfulfilling, and meaningless. Second, an erosion of emotions occurs. The positive feelings of enthusiasm, dedication, security, and enjoyment fade away and are replaced by anger, anxiety, and depression. Third, there is a problem of fit between the person and the job. Individuals see this imbalance as a personal crisis, but it is really the workplace that is in trouble (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

In their theory of burnout, Maslach and Leiter (1997) identify six mismatches between job and person. These are: (a) work overload (work is more intense, it demands more time, is more complex, and creates the exhaustion of overload); (b) lack of control
(how much control and the burden of micro-management); (c) insufficient reward
(getting less for more and losing the joy of work); (d) absence of fairness (there is no
openness, trust, or respect); (e) breakdown of community (fragmenting personal
relationships, undermining teamwork, and working separately—not together); and
(f) value conflict (what is really important and not doing what we say).

Although burnout has been identified as a problem in the workplace, not everyone
agrees that it is a problem that has to be taken seriously. Most people are content to
continue to blame the individual for some personal lack which would appear to be an
easier view for them. Ministers, as one of the groups that are susceptible to burnout in the
helping professions, seem to substantiate the conclusions (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).
Many members of the clergy seem to find themselves experiencing work overload,
lack of control, insufficient rewards, breakdown of community, and value conflicts. This
research study examined this theory more carefully among SDA ministers.

**Personal Experience**

In my 34 years of pastoral experience, I have observed that many pastors who
have been in the ministry for a long time seem to exhibit many of the same symptoms
described by Selye and Maslach. These pastors seem to become frustrated by their
inability to meet the goals they set for themselves. They begin to exhibit many behaviors
which suggest the presence of stress and burnout. They lose interest in the vocation,
refuse or curtail visitation of members, often postpone meetings, and/or just do not attend
them. They often become critical, judgmental, dictatorial, and opinionated. Sermons
become boring and lack depth. They begin to engage in risky behaviors, for example, financial improprieties, inability to manage personal resources, misappropriation of church funds, and risky and dangerous moral relationships with members. These pastors also often exhibit a reduction or lack of prayer and Bible study. In their personal lives, problems arise in their marriages and interpersonal relationships, leading to marital distress, infidelity, or abusive behaviors to spouse and children. Many ministers lose their enthusiasm for ministry, drop out of the ministry, and/or return to school to prepare for alternate professions.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined in order to understand their use in this study:

**Stress:** The summation of physical, intellectual, interpersonal, and intrapsychic symptoms which demand attention and assimilation at any given moment. According to Crider, Goethals, Kavanaugh, and Solomon (1989), “stress is a pattern of disruptive psychological and physiological functioning that occurs when an environmental event is appraised as a threat to important goals and one’s ability to cope” (p. 12).

**Burnout:** A commonly employed set of maladaptive coping reactions to high and continuing levels of perceived job stress and personal frustration, as measured the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

**Spirituality:** The thoughts, feelings, and behaviors that develop from searching for the sacred (Worthington et al., 2003). In this study, spirituality scores were obtained by requesting participants to complete a self-rating scale.
Conference: Each organized Seventh-day Adventist church is a member of the sisterhood of churches known as a conference, which is a united organized body of churches in a state, country, or territory. Until full conference status is achieved (see General Conference Working Policy, 1997, other terminology such as mission, section, delegation, or field may be used to describe the collective organization of local churches. In the Church Manual (2003) the term conference or union conference may also apply to a mission or a union mission.

Conference camp meeting: An organized set of meetings which are evangelistic in nature. Churches in a local conference are invited to attend these meetings en-mass at a specific location, for one to two weeks annually. The meetings are organized to disseminate information, teach, and instruct the membership of that particular conference in soul winning and doctrinal issues. Pastors, teachers, administrators, and local members are all in attendance and interact with each other on many levels.

District: A particular area that is under the control of a pastor. It can include a single congregation or several congregations under the leadership of a particular pastor. A clerical parish is synonymous with a district.

Ordained minister: Seventh-day Adventist clergy are usually called from college or seminary and start as licensed ministers. Although age is not listed as a qualification for ordination, it takes an average of 4 to 8 years of experience for most individuals to be ordained (General Conference Working Policy, 1997).

Seventh-day Adventist: The name Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) includes two vital beliefs for the Church: the term 'Adventist' reflects the passionate conviction
in the nearness of the soon return ('advent') of Jesus. 'Seventh-day' refers to the belief that the biblical Sabbath, from Creation on, has always been on the seventh day of the week, or Saturday.

**SDA ministers**: Adventist ministers are those individuals with at least a Doctor of Divinity or Philosophy, Master of Divinity degree, Master of Arts degree in Theology or Religion, or a Bachelor of Arts degree in Theology or Religion who have been called by an Adventist conference to pastor a congregation.

**Limitations**

Adventist pastors who participated in this study may not have been experiencing excessive stress or burnout, which could have positively skewed the results. This limitation was reduced by allowing the pastors to participate anonymously and by assuring them that individual results would not be reported.

**Delimitations**

The study was delimited to Adventist pastors who work in church districts in the North American Division of the SDA church. The sample was delimited to pastors with Doctor of Divinity, Doctor of Philosophy, Master of Divinity, Master of Arts in Theology or Religion, and/or Bachelor of Theology or Religion. Thus, generalizations are only applicable to populations similar to that from which the sample was taken.
Assumptions

The following assumptions are made for the present study:

1. It is assumed that the respondents will answer the questions truthfully, consistently, and with genuine objectivity. It was also assumed that the responses of the pastors will reflect their accurate and honest opinions.

2. It is assumed that the subjects who are pastors in church districts in the North American Division of the SDA church were representative of pastors in all church districts, to evaluate clergy burnout in those conferences.

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contains the introduction, background of the problem, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions to be answered, definition of terms, limitations and delimitations, and organization of study.

Chapter 2 presents the review of literature that focuses on stress and burnout in the clergy.

Chapter 3 presents a description of research used in this study which includes the introduction, research design, population and sample, power analysis, procedures, variables, instrumentation, null hypotheses, and methods of analysis.

Chapter 4 presents the data and analysis and an interpretation of the findings.

Chapter 5 contains the summary, findings, discussion, implications, recommendations, and conclusions.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

A comprehensive review of the literature relevant to this research study is presented with the following: definitions of stress, the theory of stress, response-based concept of stress, stimulus-based concept of stress, stimulus/response-based concept of stress, definitions of burnout, burnout research, and family/church stressors.

Definitions of Stress

Stress and the mechanisms being prescribed to relieve or reduce it are unlike many self-help approaches in that the stress concept sprang from research conducted in physiology laboratories and was firmly entrenched in the tradition of scientific technology (Parrino, 1979; Wilder & Plutchik, 1985).

While the use of the term stress and the issues encompassed by it are not new, it was the systematic attempt by Hans Selye to research and define stress that “played a dominant role in the recent expansion of interest in stress” (Parrino, 1979, p. 8). Selye dates the beginning of his own interest in stress from 1936 at the University of Prague where, as a second-year medical student, he began to wonder about "the syndrome of just being sick." His work is also credited with giving strong support to the general conviction
that social and psychological factors are important in both sickness and health (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Selye, 1993). Lazarus and Folkman (1984) refer to Selye's definition as "essentially like earlier ones that treat stress as a disturbance of homeostasis produced by environmental change" (p. 15).

According to Crider et al. (1989), "stress is a pattern of disruptive psychological and physiological functioning that occurs when an environmental event is appraised as a threat to important goals and one’s ability to cope" (p. 518). Stress has been also considered from many different perspectives as follows: it may be catalogued relative to its source; it may be generated by tensions at work, difficulties in familial relationships and friendships, or existential angst; it may also be looked at experientially, as anxiety, generalized or focused, and dysfunction; it may be considered relative to its result; and eustress motivates energy to respond to a challenge; distress is debilitating and a diminishment of constructive or coping responses (Boles, Dean, Ricks, Short, & Wang, 2000; Brissette, Scheier, & Carver, 2002; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Davey, 1995; Folkman, 1984; Friedland, Keinan, & Regev, 1992; Pappas, 1995; Plante, Saucede, & Rice, 2001; Skinner, Edge, Altman, & Sherwood, 2003; Suls, Lemos, & Steward, 2002).

Selye (1936) was using the term in a highly technical sense to mean an orchestrated set of bodily defenses against any form of noxious stimulus. Stress was, in effect, not an environmental demand (which Selye called a "stressor"), but a universal physiological set of reactions and processes created by such a demand. The first edition of Selye's major work on stress was published in 1956 under the title The Stress of Life.

Often the term stress has a negative connotation. However, Selye (1973) noted
"complete freedom from stress is death" (p. 693). Therefore, stress is a normal and natural part of daily life. According to Tanner (1976), a moderate amount of stress will improve an individual's performance. However, it must be remembered that large differences exist in people's ability to tolerate various levels of stress (Petri, 1981).

Although current conceptualizations of stress are much broader than Selye's biological view, and have expanded into an interdisciplinary search (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), his definition of stress as a nonspecific or general response of the body to any demand (Selye, 1993) is still very useful, particularly in view of the physical symptoms manifested in both stress and burnout.

Petri (1981) defined the stress response as:

an adaptive behavior that attempts to return the body to its normal state. As such, stress is a homoeostatic mechanism. Either systemic or psychological stress, then, can be viewed as an adaptive response designed to return the individual to a more optimal condition. (p. 74)

In general terms, stress occurs "when the body is forced to cope with or adapt to a changed situation, which may be either good or bad" (Petri, 1981, p. 74). Systemic stress refers to challenges to the physical body that may be due to bacteria, viruses, heat, cold, or other factors. In therapeutic situations, psychological stress results from worry related to situations such as an overabundance of paperwork or too few clients (Petri, 1981). Tanner (1976) reminds us that a moderate amount of stress seems to be necessary to improve performance.
Theory of Stress

A three-stage response to stress was developed by Selye (1956) which is termed the General Adaptation Syndrome (GAS). The three stages are: the alarm stage; the stage of resistance; and the stage of exhaustion. During the alarm stage, the body recognizes the stressor and prepares for fight or flight. In the stage of resistance, the body attempts to return to homeostasis or its normal functioning level. When the body remains in high stress for a long period of time, the stage of exhaustion occurs. If the stress level remains high, the individual is apt to develop various stress-related diseases including ulcers, hypertension, and arthritis (Rosenhan & Seligman, 1989; Selye, 1956).

Symptoms of stress can be divided into four classifications: (a) physiological, (b) psychological, (c) behavioral, and (d) psychosomatic. Physiological symptoms include headaches, increased respiration, ulcers, hypertension, and heart attack. Psychological symptoms include tension, anxiety, depression, boredom, psychological fatigue, anger, low morale, and hostility. Behavioral symptoms include absenteeism and job change, loss of appetite, weight gain or loss, increased alcohol use, and social withdrawal. Psychosomatic symptoms include asthma and spastic colitis (Moracco, 1981; Schuler, 1982).

Leventhal and Tomarken (1987) conceptualize stress in two major ways: as a unitary, underlying biological process, or as a complex model of multiple social-psychological processes. As found in Lazarus and Folkman (1984), Walter Cannon defined stress in 1932 as a disturbance of homeostasis under conditions, for example, of cold, lack of oxygen, and low blood sugar.
However, others have indicated that stress can be positive and beneficial in addition to having negative aspects (Petri, 1981; Schuler, 1982; Tanner, 1976). Zastrow (1984) stated, "Much stress is beneficial. Stress increases our concentration and enhances our capacities to accomplish physical tasks" (p. 144). Ardell (1981) warned us saying, "Stress is generally presented as a silent but pervasive hazard. It is usually considered a major factor if not the primary cause of dozens of gruesome diseases" (p. 6). However, he cautions, stress does not need to be viewed exclusively in negative terms. Ardell (1981) concludes by saying "that the positive facet of this stress phenomenon is ever so much more attractive and useful than the prevailing negative connotation" (p. 6).

In 1966, Lazarus suggested that stress be treated as an organizing concept for understanding a wide range of phenomena of great importance in human and animal adaptation. If stress is treated as a generic concept, its meaning within a single study needs to be delimited. Basically, he defined stress in three different ways: (a) based on response; (b) based on stimulus (the presence of stressors in the individual's environment); and (c) based on a combination of stimulus-response reactions (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). These three different modes will now be further explored.

Response-Based Concept of Stress

The first mode proposed by Lazarus (1966) is a definition of stress based on the person's response (referring to a person as being under stress, or reacting with stress), and is sometimes understood in terms of an engineering analogy. That is, stress is a force that
induces strain or deformation if it passes beyond the 'elastic' limit of the material. According to the analogy, people, like physical things, have certain tolerance limits, beyond which psychophysiological damage will result (Sethi, 1989). Other research (Folkman, 1984) suggests that such a response-based definition of stress requires an appraisal of the properties of the person.

Leaning towards the response-based concept of stress, Adams (1992) distinguishes pressure from stress by defining the latter as an "overly taxing pressure self-inflicted on the body by handling pressure wrongly," and having to do with attitudes such as "worry, bitterness, fear, etc." (p. 14). Vest (1991) expresses the distinction this way: "Pressure comes from the situation; stress comes from the body" (p. 2).

Working also from a response-based definition of stress, Boyd's study (1982) sought to relate Type A/B behavior to perceptions of organizational roles. It theorized that, since Type A individuals inevitably seek out stressful work environments, there would be a higher incidence of Type A individuals, versus Type B, in a sample of ministers ($n = 89$). The second major hypothesis was that there would be a significant positive correlation between Type A behavior and the following role stressors: (a) quantitative role overload (excessive workload); (b) qualitative role overload (when the range of demands exceeds the individual's capabilities); (c) role conflict (when two or more role expectations interfere or contradict each other); and (d) role ambiguity (when expectations of others are unclear or confusing). The results were mixed. Sixty percent of respondents were classified as Type A, but only Quantitative Role Overload correlated with the overall Type A scale. Since correlational studies do not establish
causality, the author speculated whether a reduced workload might moderate the
tendency towards Type A behavior in pastoral work.

Stimulus-Based Concept of Stress

The second mode is when stress is viewed only as a reaction to a stimulus. Here
individual responses to said stimuli may vary considerably, and although there may be
no systematic way of identifying prospectively what will be a stressor and what will not,
this has not deterred stressor research. Kasl (1987) argues in favor of the objective
identification of the stimulus or stressor condition and its examination as a risk factor
for some disease outcome.

In their attempt to categorize types of stressors, Elliot and Eisdorfer (as cited in
Valdivia, 1998) identified four broad types that differed primarily in their duration:
(a) Acute, time-limited stressors, such as awaiting for a surgery or encountering a
rattlesnake; (b) stressor sequences, or series of events that occur over an extended period
of time, such as a job loss, divorce, or bereavement; (c) chronic intermittent stressors,
such as conflict-filled visits to in-laws or sexual difficulties; and (d) chronic stressors,
such as permanent disabilities, parental discord, or chronic job stress. They suggested that
when addressing job or occupational stress, theoretical models should consider both the
chronic and episodic nature of stress. Chronic stress situations are more permanent and
long-lasting in nature and may be viewed as a necessary part of the corporate culture.
These daily hassles have been found to be better predictors of health outcomes than
episodic life events. According to Bailey and Bhagat (1987), most research in job stress
has focused attention on stressful events of a short-term duration.

It has been found that low time duration of stressful events correlates with low severity of the stressful situation, and high duration correlates with high severity (Bailey & Bhagat, 1987). This attention to the duration of stressors recognizes that stress operates over time. The stress/emotion process promotes physiological processes that may initiate disease at a much later time (Leventhal & Tomarken, 1987).

It has also been noted that exposure to the stressor, whether it be an electrical shock, the loss of a job, or death of a spouse, is not sufficient to predict disease outcome. Individuals differ in their response to the "same" stressor. The response to the stimulus (how it is perceived and thought about) is the key to the generation of the stress process (Leventhal & Tomarken, 1987). McGrath (1976) emphasized that individual perception of both the stressor and the coping process it requires is important:

A potential for stress exists when an environmental situation is perceived as presenting a demand which threatens to exceed the person's capabilities and resources for meeting it, under conditions where he expects a substantial differential in the rewards and costs from meeting the demand versus not meeting it. (p. 1352)

Stimulus-Response-Based Concept of Stress

The third mode of stress proposed by Lazarus (1966) defines stress in the context of a combination of stimulus-response reactions, and pays attention to the intervening processes such as coping mechanisms, psychological defenses, and the individual's appraisal system in a given environment (Sethi, 1989). Along this line, Lazarus goes beyond Selye's concept of a "stereotyped physiological reaction" and the engineering
analogy by defining stress as "a relationship between the person and the environment that is appraised by the person as taxing or exceeding his or her resources and as endangering well-being" (Folkman, 1984, p. 19).

During the past three decades, concern for the impact of socially induced stress on health has grown, and a stress-strain model of health has been developed and repeatedly tested in the occupational context (Haines, Hurlbert, & Zimmer, 1991). According to this model, stress is an environmental change followed by an attempt to adapt by the person experiencing the stress. Faulty adaptive efforts generate strain, which can lead to mental illness, physical illness, or suicide.

**Definitions of Burnout**

Burnout, a critical issue whose emphasis strongly began in the 1980s, is a prominent fact of life in today's society and is currently an even more popular concern than stress (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Fisher, Francis, & Johnson, 2000; Green & Walkey, 1988; Hart, 1984; Kahill, 1988; Oswald, 1991; Pines, 2000; Sanford, 1982; Sewell & Sewell, 1997/1998; Stanton-Rich & Iso-Ahola, 1998; Virginia, 1998). Chernis (1982) points out that the very popularity of burnout has become a major obstacle to defining it. Freudenberg, a New York psychoanalyst, is credited with being the first to use the term "burnout" in reference to a state of physical and emotional exhaustion arising from a work situation (Freudenberg, 1980). He defined burnout as "someone in a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected rewards" (Freudemberger, 1980, p. 13).
Edelwich and Brodsky (1980) define burnout as the "progressive loss of idealism, energy and purpose experienced by people in the helping professions as a result of the conditions of their work" (p. 17). This definition highlights the conflict between high expectations and daily job realities, and is reflected in Dale's (1984) remark that "burnout is the ash heap of idealism. High expectations, when confronted by harsh realities, trigger a loss of will. That's burnout" (p. 27). Chernis (1982) also focused on motivational changes when he defined burnout as the "psychological withdrawal from work in response to excessive stress or dissatisfaction" (p. 16).

Pines et al. (1981) defined burnout as a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion,

characterized by physical depletion, by feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, by emotional drain, and by the development of negative self-concept and negative attitudes towards work, life, and other people... [and a] sense of distress, discontent, and failure in the quest for ideals is resident in burnout. (pp. 15-16)

Maslach (1982a), a social psychologist, defined burnout as

a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind. It is a response to the chronic emotional strain of dealing extensively with other human beings, particularly when they are troubled or having problems. (p. 7)

In fact, Maslach’s (1978) viewpoint of burnout is the most popular in the literature along with burnout’s three main components: (1) Emotional Exhaustion, (2) Depersonalization, and (3) Personal Accomplishment (for a complete discussion of these three components please refer to chapter 3) (Boles et al., 2000; Byrne, 1994; Cordes & Dougherty, 1993; Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Green & Walkey, 1988; Kirsch, 2001; Lee & Ashforth, 1990, 1993, 1996; Maslach & Jackson,
Perhaps part of the popularity of Maslach's view can be explained in terms of her stance on the 'who' versus the 'what' of burnout; in other words, whether the people who burn out are defective people or whether the nature of the job situation is also to be blamed. Maslach maintains that her research findings strongly support a focus that "allows for the possibility that the nature of the job may precipitate burnout and not just the nature of the person performing that job" (1982b, p. 9). Taking such a position allows for burnout to be the result of the interaction of both personal and environmental factors, a position that corresponds with the relational view of stress taken by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). But definitions do not adequately reflect the destructive potential covered by the stress/burnout concepts.

**Burnout Research**

Rassieur (1982) stated that pastors are quite competitive and will find their first 10 years to be a "sprint" to succeed to large pulpits or denominational leadership positions. During this time of "mid-level positioning," they will face the greatest stress factors of their careers and thus be most prone to burnout. Because pastors are placed in the hierarchy of the church at mid-level management, they are correspondingly the ones most likely to experience burnout, according to this study.

Thus, burnout is a subject that is important to understand. Its causes and its results are areas that are now being explored and researched in many fields and careers. Pines et al. (1981) have been studying burnout and life tedium for the past several years. Through their formal research and conducting cognitive and experiential workshops for thousands of people, they have discovered what causes burnout, how it affects people, and how best
to cope with it. They suggest that, while burnout can be an extraordinarily painful and distressing experience, if properly handled, it can be overcome. It can be the first step toward increased self-awareness, enriched human understanding, and a precursor of important life changes, growth, and development.

Persons of all vocations suffer burnout. Demaray (1983) stated that recent studies of one seminary’s alumni indicates that burnout most often happens 5 years after graduation. Another researcher, Fennick (1992), showed that American schoolteachers tended to burnout between the fifth and the sixth year of service. There are multiple causes for dropout, but studies show acute fatigue as one of the significant dynamics. The current duration of service norm for inner-city social workers and inner-city lawyers turned out to be only 2 years, according to Demaray (1983). He reported that one stateside psychiatrist counted 50% of his clients as missionaries. He also reported that a large denomination stated that they lose a thousand clergy annually.

If the person's response is the basis of the stress process, it would appear personality would certainly play a major role in indicating which individuals have a greater possibility of developing stress problems. The literature expresses conflicting views on this issue. Although Daniel and Rogers (1982) suggested that pastors may be predisposed to burnout by their personality type (perfectionistic, introspective, isolated, detached, etc.), an earlier statement in the same article, based on general burnout research, suggested that "it is the social, interpersonal pressures of the job, and not a basic personality fault within the worker that is responsible for burn-out" (p. 233). Other factors, besides personality, may correlate more robustly with burnout. According to the same review, burnout candidates tended to be pastors within the 30-49 age group, involved with major denominations, and pastoring a church of fewer than 300 members.
Stressors Related to Minister's Role

Since burnout has many similarities to the symptoms of depression, and stress probably plays a causal role in burnout, Fletcher (1990) conducted a study of 230 parochial clergy from the Church of England. His research studied symptoms of depression and burnout, searched for responses on the areas of quantitative overload (which assessed actual amount of work), role expectations and ambiguities (which asked about pressure from superiors and social roles), role conflict (to assess if peripheral activities detracted from central role), job demands (to learn sources of demands), disillusionment with parochial ministry, and others. Stepwise multiple regression was employed to find the best predictors of depression. In his study, the data analysis showed that job demands were the strongest predictor of depression, followed closely by job disillusionment. A further analysis of particular items showed that burnout was related to: (a) Expectation that I have no right to reply to criticism; (b) Lack of tangible results; (c) Having to satisfy expectations of others; and (d) Having to be nice to people (Fletcher, 1990).

Wallstrom (1990) conducted a study of 103 Seventh-day Adventist pastors on the effects of role pressures upon psychological strain in the ministry. It employed vignettes to assess their responses to problem situations and how they estimated how key persons (local and supervisory leaders) in their ministry context would respond. Results showed that role conflict correlated to burnout as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Furthermore, it was shown that years in the ministry correlated with less burnout ($k = .26, p < .005$), and also correlated negatively with emotional exhaustion ($k = -.26, p < .01$). Depersonalization burnout was shown to occur when ministers consistently capitulated to the values of others and implemented the values of others more than their own.
Another primary source of strain leading to burnout is the burden of feeling responsibility for another's well-being. Inherent to the ministry is feeling responsible and caring for an entire church. But while having the responsibility for the well-being of the congregation, the minister does not have the power to make the needed changes (Daniel & Rogers, 1982).

In a review of literature that considered variables related to burnout, the variables that correlate negatively with burnout were shown to be absent from the experience of the ministry as a whole (Moore, 1991). These included: being aware of one's own limit; a separation between work and home; training on managing personal stress and stressful relationships; realistic goals; group meetings of peers on a regular basis for support and advice; support systems, and limiting work hours.

In trying to catalog the sources of stress in the ministry, a number of stressors could be related to the nature of the minister's role. An early application of role conflict theory was made by Blizzard (1956). He suspected that ministers understood their role based on their theology and seminary training, but the congregation had a different set of expectations. Blizzard designed an instrument that asked 690 Protestant ministers to evaluate six ministerial roles or activities: administrator, organizer, pastor, preacher, priest, and teacher. The results showed that what the pastors enjoyed and thought they should do was not what they thought the congregation expected of them. He concluded that most ministers suffer from role conflict.

A later study by Blackmon (1984) followed Blizzard's model to look at different roles in the ministry and had the pastors rate them in terms of enjoyment and importance. It revealed that pastors spend much time doing what they do not enjoy. The study of 300 ministers reported seven "emotional hazards" for clergy: finances, relationships, stress,
role conflict, seminary preparation, sexuality, and internal or psychological hazards. Three-quarters of the sample also reported sleeping less than 7 hours per night and exercising only once a week or less.

Of the hazards identified by Blackmon (1984), the literature suggests that clergy stress is most often associated with role conflicts. Ministers usually need to meet high role expectations. A successful pastor should exhibit traits such as: focus, adequate self-esteem, loyalty, empathy, caring, enthusiasm, assertiveness, and business thinking. Added to this is the unique pressure to be holy and righteous. Besides having and modeling these traits, pastors are expected to provide moral guidance and are often the first persons called when individuals and families are in crisis. Many people will go to no one else when they need counseling, but the minister himself seldom has someone in whom to confide (Galli, 1994; Hatcher & Underwood, 1990; Hulme, 1985; Rebeck, 1993; Richmond, Rayburn, & Rogers, 1985).

A thought-provoking essay by Kok (1978) pointed to one possible cause of great tension in the ministry: explaining his life and his vocation in spiritual, self-denying terms (being a suffering servant), and failing to account for human factors such as ambition and aggressiveness. He proposed that leading this double life, denying one and affirming the other, took a lot of energy and generated a great deal of internal conflict.

A pastor may view his position in a different way than that of his church board members and may be the subject of strong criticism from his parishioners. This differing set of expectations produces a high level of role conflict in the ministry (DeLuca, 1980; Randall, 1998; Walker, 1993; Weiser, 1994). Richmond et al. (1985) also identified role conflict, along with workload, communication difficulties, and working conditions, as occupational stressors for the clergy. Even the ministry itself may be evolving and
creating new role conflicts for the clergy.

Recent research on pastoral roles and leadership yielded 10 factors through factor analysis of ministerial activity: (a) Preacher/Priest; (b) Administrator; (c) Personal/Spiritual Model; (d) Visitor/Counselor; (e) Community-minded Minister; (f) Minister to Youth/Children; (g) Teacher; (h) Evangelist; (i) Equipper/Trainer; and (j) Personal/Enabler. Skills of intentional/active ministry were deemed necessary at every level of church size and for every function of the ministry; but unlike the top-down leadership style of past generations, the modern minister appears to be also expected to be considerate, permissive, consensual, and relations-oriented (Allen, 1995). Hadden (1969) concluded in a study of clergy and laity, which investigated the beliefs of the ministry, that during the 60s the clergy had developed a new purpose for the church (i.e., social action), but had not taken the laity with them. Furthermore, the laity was not as aware or as concerned with doctrine as was the minister.

Blanton's review of the literature (1992) identified five external stressors experienced by clergy families. These factors were termed: mobility, financial compensation, expectations and time demands, intrusions of family boundaries, and social support. The mobility stressor reflects the physical, social, emotional, and cognitive adjustments associated with the process of relocation (Blanton, Morris, & Anderson, 1990). Frequent relocations undermine the family's sense of confidence in settling down. Dealing also with the issue of mobility, in their study of relocation stress among clergy families, Wiggins and Shehan (1994) suggested that a family's adaptation to a crisis situation such as relocation was negatively influenced by the severity of the pile-up of demands the family members were experiencing.

Blanton's (1992) second stressor was related to the low compensation of ministers
when compared to other professionals. Clergy ranked in the top 10% of the population in terms of education, but ranked 325th out of 432 occupations in terms of salary (Morris & White, 1994). Mace and Mace (1980) found that 95% of all clergy were underpaid. Apart from this, the clergy did not have organized channels for collective bargaining or requesting greater remuneration for their services (Morris & White, 1994). In direct relationship with the subject of compensation, working conditions had also been often mentioned as a possible source of stress in the ministry (Richmond et al., 1985).

Expectations and time demands were the third stressor named by Blanton (1992). Not having time together as a family eroded family identity and cohesion. A minister could be on call 24 hours a day, which made for unpredictable time demands. The needs of the congregation sometime required that family time be postponed and/or relegated. This led to conditions of loneliness and isolation among many clergy families (Morris & Blanton, 1994a).

The fourth stressor mentioned by Blanton (1992) noted the issue of family boundaries or the lack thereof. Work/family stressors for clergy families focused around this issue. Boundaries are both the physical and emotional separations between systems, subsystems, and roles that are necessary for adequate functioning. Boss (1980) reported that boundary ambiguity was a barrier to family stress management. However, many descriptions of clergy family life were striking in the emphasis placed on issues of boundary ambiguity. Numerous studies found that clergy couples described a "gold-fish bowl syndrome" in which they felt a lack of privacy and sanctity for their family (Lee & Balswick, 1989; Mace & Mace, 1980; Mellow, 2002).

A survey of clergy wives found that 30% felt that the "goldfish bowl" existence of their family was the most problematic aspect of their family's situation (Douglas, 1965).
Lee and Balswick (1989) used the concept of intrusion in describing issues related to clarity of family boundaries. In their study they found that clergy families who rated their congregation as more intrusive were also families that reported higher levels of stress.

The parsonage system used by some churches may be part of the boundary problems. The clergy family often ends up living in the "church's house" and the psychological sense of ownership of their home may be adversely affected. These problems appeared many times heightened if the parsonage was in close physical proximity to the church and church members were literally on their doorstep much of the time with repeated requests (Lee & Balswick, 1989; Melander & Eppley, 2002; Oswald, 1991; Ramey, 2000).

The time demands of the pastor's role, along with time conflicts for clergy in relation to their spouse's and children's schedules, make it difficult to establish clear family boundaries. Orthner (as cited in Blanton, 1992) found that clergy averaged being away from home 12 evenings a month. Norrell (1989) pointed out that clergy were "on call" 7 days a week.

The weekend, which for most families is an assumed time for leisure, appeared to be a time when ministers' job demands intensified. Some spouses and children found it difficult to complain about lack of time to be together when the minister is doing "God's work." Clergy and their families often felt that it would be inappropriate and unChristian to establish times for family and couple togetherness that were relatively inviolate. A significant problem among clergy couples was a lack of time spent with their spouse (London & Wiseman, 1993; Morris & Blanton, 1994b; Sperry, 2000).

Constructing boundaries between the clergy family and the church that are unambiguous but permeable is a challenging process. The family, in order to function
effectively, had to be neither disengaged from nor enmeshed in the church. Striking such a balance was not easily accomplished (Lee, 1986). The same study found that ministers’ wives reported even fewer coping resources and poorer well-being than their husbands. A significant factor in this buildup of negative emotional pressure was the intrusion of family boundaries, one of the stressors identified by Blanton (1992), and one which was mentioned in several other studies.

The fifth stressor mentioned was Social Support. Social networks provide strong support for families and individuals, and also serve both as a buffer from stress as well as a coping resource when stressors were experienced (Cobb, 1976). Houts (1982), who has worked in a counseling role with clergy couples, stated:

More than any other surprise to me has been the growing awareness that most clergy couples have very limited stabilizing friendships. They have an immediate acceptance into the church community, and yet are often treated as misfits, wallflowers, or china dolls in the social fabric of the community. (p. 148)

This description of clergy couples was substantiated by a comparison of clergy couples to nonclergy couples, which revealed that clergy couples reported greater loneliness (Warner & Carter, 1984).

Lee and Balswick (1989) discussed the importance of congregational integration for clergy families: A high level of integration means the clergy families feel that they are part of the congregation but that their separateness as a family is recognized and affirmed. They found that clergy families who were more integrated into their congregations had lower levels of family stress. Mace and Mace (1980) noted in their findings that clergy wives reported greater dissatisfaction with their social lives and friendships than did their husbands.

The Episcopal Family Network (1988) also found that wives reported feeling lonely and isolated more often than their husbands. Niswander (1982) supported this
conclusion with her description of clergy wives and the loneliness they experience. She further pointed out that loneliness was most acute for wives who were mothers of young children, who do not work outside of the home, and whose social contacts were limited to the church congregation.

These issues are of concern to clergy as well as their wives and children. Hunt (1978) found that clergy and clergy wives ranked loneliness, lack of close friends, and concerns about their social lives among the most stressful issues they had to face. Alexander (1980), in his survey of directors of pastoral care and counseling, addressed the development of a relatively isolated lifestyle for clergy families. A lack of social support was associated with clergy families' concerns about issues of competition, fears of divulged confidences, and fears of congregational jealousy.

A common thread running through these various descriptions of the social networks of clergy families was the need for friendships outside of the congregation and opportunities for involvement with other clergy families to heighten the types and extent of social support available to clergy families. Ministers reported lack of personal friends, lack of time with family, and lack of privacy, along with feelings of loneliness and isolation (Henry, Chertok, Keys, & Jegerski, 1991; Mace & Mace, 1980; Morris & Blanton, 1994a, 1994b; Randall, 1998).

**Family/Church Stressors**

There is ample support for studying clergy stress in the context of the clergy family and the interaction between family and congregation (Lee, 1995). In a literature review of stress in the ministry and the minister's family, Moy and Malony (1987) suggested that the minister's family life and children were a potential asset or deficit to the minister's work, and that it seemed inevitable that the stress the minister experienced
in fulfilling his/her role would have negative effects on all the members of his/her family. The disadvantages of clergy marriages had already been described in order of highest frequency as: marriage expected to be a model of perfection, time pressures, lack of family privacy, and children expected to model church's expectations (Mace & Mace, 1980). It would be hard to overestimate the centrality of the family in the ministerial profession.

Jud et al. (1970) noted the influence of the family on the pastor's ministry. The source of praise most highly prized by both former and present pastors was that of their wives, which was desired above that of close friends, denominational leaders, lay leaders, and fellow ministers. Yet, 54% of former pastors' wives wanted to leave the ministry. Only 12% preferred to stay. Over half of the former pastors saw their wives and children as unhappy in the role of a minister's family.

Hoge, Dyble, and Polk (1981) studied commitment to the ministry in 667 Chicago pastors from seven different denominations. They found that the most important factor in deciding whether to quit the ministry had to do with the spouse's satisfaction with the role of pastor's wife or husband. Dissatisfied spouses had a clearly negative effect on the minister's commitment to his work. Clergy spouses were more content when the minister felt personally fulfilled, when the congregation was positive, and when the couple was older. The family may act as a conduit for stresses as well as a primary source of stress. It may also be a mediating force in the stress process, a place where the individual can find the resources to deal with stress (Pearlin & Turner, 1987).

Four types of strain have been conceptualized as occurring within the family and other institutional spheres (Pearlin & Turner, 1987). One type of strain concerned the level of demands and pressures that one encountered in one's family roles. This was the
familial counterpart to job pressures, referring to the interplay between the magnitude of one's functions and the limits of time and energy available for performing those tasks.

The next type of strain concerned interpersonal conflict in the family. The third and fourth types of strain were: role captivity (being bound in one role while preferring another), and the restructuring of established family roles (due to death or changes in developmental stages of children and parents) (Pearlin & Turner, 1987).

Another area of interest to researchers that impacts the family situation is that of marital satisfaction in the clergy family. Valenzuela (1991) observed that marital satisfaction has been widely researched because of its importance and impact on the family and on life in general. He identified several major variables affecting marital satisfaction which include the following: communication, religion, leisure activities, finances, sexuality, working outside the home, and children. Although treatment of these variables is beyond the scope of this study, it is important to note them here as they shed insight into conditions that affect the clergy family.

The stress produced in the family by the ministry is found to be related to the quality of marriage. The ministry has been found to be a very stressful profession (Hart, 1984). It has a significant impact on pastoral marriages, according to Merrill (1985).

These are not the only levels of family-related stressors. According to Pearlin and Turner (1987) one way that stress initiated in roles outside the family promotes stress within the family is through the disruptive transfer to the household of emotional disturbances aroused elsewhere, such as in the job setting. Another way is through the competition or incompatibility among the multiple roles played by family members, when the duties, obligations, and investments in the outside role intrude in the expectations and performance of family roles (Pearlin & Turner, 1987).
In the context of the ministry and the way it intrudes in the healthy fulfillment of family roles, Merrill (1985) refers to the church as The Other Woman, whose "husband isn't unrighteous for sleeping with her. . . . Most women bear this 'affair' in silence for several years, until the pressure becomes intolerable" (pp. 55-56).

There are many challenges to the boundaries of the clergy family. Concerns regarding privacy have been termed the "goldfish" syndrome (Rayburn, Richmond, & Rogers, 1986). As clergy will attest, congregations can be very intrusive. Church members often expect a great deal of their pastors and these expectations can intrude on the family in ways which would not be tolerated in other social contexts (Lee & Balswick, 1989).

Expectations of church members are often communicated through acts that invade the autonomy of the clergy family (Greenfield, 2001; Lee, 1995). Ministers' wives report being watched in the supermarket to see what kind of food they buy on a pastor's salary. Families who live in parsonages report that church members keep a close watch on the activities of the family, since the parsonage is viewed as church property rather than a private residence. In some cases, parishioners simply walk into the parsonage unannounced and unanticipated (Greenfield, 2001; Lee, 1995).

In Morris and Blanton's study (1994b), intrusiveness was a significant predictor of marital satisfaction and parental satisfaction for both spouses, as well as predicting life satisfaction for the husbands. The problem of intrusiveness of work into the family life of the clergy probably needs to be explained in the context of the Christian ministerial ethic of self-sacrifice, which sometimes contradicts the cultural norms of privacy. The ministry is not simply a job but is a vocation, a holy calling, a way of life, and not just a way to make a living. In order to adjust, the family needs to create a conceptual frame for the
ministry that helps them tolerate the intrusions without rejecting the calling (Lee, 1995).

Several studies have suggested that the ministry is a difficult vocation (Blackmon, 1984; Ellison & Mattila, 1982; Malony, 1988; Mills & Koval, 1971; Ostrander, Henry, & Fournier, 1994). O'Donnell and O'Donnell (1991) point to several stressors in the ministerial profession (cultural stress, organizational stress, physical stress, psychological stress, and spiritual stress, etc.), and suggest that employing agencies should provide stress care through services based on prevention, training, direct involvement, and restoration.

Studies of ex-ministers have revealed some of the reasons for leaving the profession. In a study of ex-pastors by Jud et al. (1970), the reasons for leaving the ministry were as follows: (a) A sense of personal and professional inadequacy (15%); (b) Feelings of professional entrapment such as feeling unable to relocate (15%); (c) Problems at home with a spouse or children (13%); (d) Illness or breakdown (10%); and (e) Financial reasons (6%). Van Rooyen (1996) conducted a qualitative study of Seventh-day Adventist ex-ministers and identified eight reasons for leaving the ministry: (a) Inability to cope; (b) Pull factors (the decision to move to a more fulfilling professional position); (c) Marital difficulty, (d) Doctrinal dissonance; (e) Restrictions on freedom of the mind; (f) Discovery of a new hermeneutic (new way of interpreting doctrine); (g) Problems with administrators; and (h) Stability of the status quo (denominational intransigence).

Summary

In summary, the review of the literature presented an overall view of stress, burnout, and ministers in relation to stress and burnout. The definitions of stress are numerous in the literature but there are several key definitions. One definition is by
Crider et al. (1989): “Stress is a pattern of disruptive psychological and physiological functioning that occurs when an environmental event is appraised as a threat to important goals and one’s ability to cope” (p. 518). Stress may be catalogued relative to its source such as tensions at work, difficulties in familial relationships, or existential angst. It may also be looked at experientially as anxiety (generalized or focused) and dysfunction. Stress may also be considered relative to its result such as eustress and distress. Thus eustress motivates energy to respond to a challenge; distress is debilitating, a diminishment of constructive responses.

In general terms, stress occurs "when the body is forced to cope with or adapt to a changed situation, which may be either good or bad" (Petri, 1981, p. 74). Systemic stress refers to challenges to the physical body that may be due to bacteria, viruses, heat, cold, or other factors. In therapeutic situations, psychological stress results from worry related to situations such as an overabundance of paperwork or too few clients (Petri, 1981). In 1966, Lazarus defined stress in three different ways: (a) based on response; (b) based on stimulus (the presence of stressors in the individual's environment); and (c) based on a combination of stimulus-response reactions.

Selye’s (1993) definition of stress as a nonspecific or general response of the body to any demand is one of the most widely used definitions of stress. He developed, in 1956, a three-stage response to stress called the General Adaptation Syndrome (GAS). The three stages are: the alarm stage; the stage of resistance; and the stage of exhaustion. During the alarm stage, the body recognizes the stressor and prepares for fight or flight. In the stage of resistance, the body attempts to return to homeostasis or its normal functioning level. When the body remains in high stress for a long period of time, the stage of exhaustion occurs. If the stress level remains high, the individual is apt to
develop various stress-related diseases including ulcers, hypertension, and arthritis.

The second area reviewed was the topic of burnout which began to be a critical issue in the 1980s and has increased in prominence with each passing decade. In fact, burnout is often experienced throughout a variety of careers on a daily basis. But, the very popularity of burnout has often been quite a hindrance in actually defining it.

Two main authors who presented the most encompassing definitions of burnout are Freudenberger and Maslach. Freudenberger (1980) defined burnout as "someone in a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected rewards" (p. 13). Maslach (1982b) defined burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind. It is a response to the chronic emotional strain of dealing extensively with other human beings” (p. 7).

The third area reviewed was the topic of ministers in relation to stress and burnout. Rassieur (1982) stated that pastors are quite competitive and will find their first 10 years to be a “sprint” to succeed to large pulpits or denominational leadership positions. During this time of “mid-level positioning,” they will face the greatest stress factors of their careers and thus be most prone to burnout. Because pastors are placed in the hierarchy of the church at mid-level management, they are correspondingly the ones most likely to experience burnout according to this study. The minister and his/her family are also related to stress and burnout in the clergy. The minister's family life and children are a potential asset or deficit to the minister's work and the level of stress experienced by the minister in fulfilling his/her role may negatively affect the family. Clergy marriages are often expected to be a model of perfection, often lack privacy, and the children are
expected to meet the church's expectations (Mace & Mace, 1980; Moy & Malony, 1987).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents a description of the research used in this study: introduction, research design, population and sample, power analysis, procedures, variables, instrumentation, null hypotheses, and statistical analysis.

Research Design

This research explores the relationships between pastoral burnout and age, highest educational degree earned, years of service, church size, and number of children (excluded variables included Gender, Marital Status, Highest Level of Education Completed, Primary Area of Work, Primary Position Held, Years of Pastoral Experience, and Ethnicity). It was conducted by using a survey method in which pastors in selected conferences were requested to respond to two questionnaires: the Pastoral Services Demographic Data Sheet (PSDDS) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). The correlation matrix of a regression analysis was used to separately explore the interrelationships among age, years of service, church size, and children and burnout.

Multiple regression was used to study the relationship between pastoral burnout and each of the variables mentioned. A multiple regression analysis
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was used to determine the strongest model of the combination of these variables in relation to burnout and to establish their relative importance in the model.

**Population and Sample**

Participants in the study were Seventh-day Adventist clergy who work in church districts in the North American Division of the SDA church. The Seventh-day Adventist denomination was organized in 1863 in North America. Seventh-day Adventists are Christ-centered, conservative evangelicals who teach that salvation is a gift, received by God's grace, through faith, and emphasize healthful living. They believe in Christ's soon return to earth and service to others. In a little over a century, the church has grown to almost 13 million members, most of whom live outside North America (*Seventh-day Adventist Yearbook*, 1997).

Conference presidents were contacted and asked for permission to survey their workers and supply lists of active ministers in their states. Both ordained and unordained ministers made up the research sample. Seventh-day Adventist clergy are usually called from college or seminary and start as licensed ministers. Although age is not listed as a qualification for ordination, it takes an average of 4 to 8 years of experience for most individuals to be ordained (*General Conference Working Policy*, 1997).

A demographic data sheet was used to collect the participants' age in increments of 5 years. They were asked about gender, age, highest educational degree earned, years of pastoral experience, church size, and number of children. Since pastoral experience or tenure is also a factor in ordination, and because an ordained minister has demonstrated
through positive experience in the clerical profession that he is fit to practice it, ordination status was used to represent sufficient tenure, and being unordained was taken to measure insufficient tenure.

**Power Analysis**

Power analysis was undertaken, using the tables in Cohen (1969). With alpha = 0.05, power = 0.90, and moderate effect size ($r = 0.30$), Table 3.4.1 (Cohen, 1969, p. 99) gives required sample size as 112. The population should yield well over the required number of respondents.

**Procedures**

First, I applied to Andrews University (AU) Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) for permission to conduct this research study. After obtaining HSIRB approval, I contacted the conference president of the Arizona Conference of SDAs and obtained written permission to conduct this research study. After I obtained his approval, I then attended various camp meetings and workers meetings and distributed the research packets.

At the beginning of each meeting, I distributed one manila envelope (packet) to each pastor and said the following: “My name is W. Don Edwards. I have been working in the pastoral field since 1969. At the present time, I am working as the Pastor of the Beacon Light SDA Church in Phoenix and am serving as the African American Coordinator for the Arizona Conference. I am also currently a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology at Andrews University. I am working on my dissertation which
basically looks at stress in the ministry. I am asking for your participation in this research study which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete two research instruments. Your name will not be used in any way, so your responses will be confidential and anonymous. I want to emphasize that your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose to not participate, you will not be penalized in any way. If you choose to participate, you are still free to withdraw at any time during the testing process without any penalty. Are there any questions? Let us begin. I'd like you to use the pencil provided in the research packet. Please open your research packet, read the instructions, complete the two enclosed research instruments (Pastoral Services Demographic Data Sheet and MBI Human Services Survey), return the two instruments to the manila envelope, seal it, and return it to me. Thank you so very much for your time and participation.”

Variables

Independent Variables

The factors, as measured by the Demographic Variables, were: (a) Age, (b) Spirituality, (c) Years Married, (d) Number of Children, (e) Hours on the Job, (f) Hours With the Family, (g) Time in Present Employment, (h) Time Employed, (i) Number of Congregations, (j) Number of Members, (k) Number of Moves, and (l) Counseling (excluded variables included Gender, Marital Status, Highest Level of Education Completed, Primary Area of Work, Primary Position Held, Years of Pastoral Experience, and Ethnicity).
Dependent Variables

The three dimensions of pastoral burnout, measured by the MBI, were:
(a) Emotional Exhaustion; (b) Depersonalization; and (c) Personal Accomplishment.

Maslach et al. (1996) define these three variables as follows:

The Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale assesses feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one’s work. The Depersonalization (Dp) subscale measures an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of one’s service, care, treatment, or instruction. The Personal Accomplishment (PA) subscale assesses feelings of competence and successful achievement in one’s work with people. (pp. 4-5)

Instrumentation

Two instruments with salient psychometric features were employed in this study. These instruments are widely identified by numerous previous researchers:
(1) Pastoral Services Demographic Data Sheet (Revised), and (2) The Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS), which has three subscales: (a) Emotional Exhaustion (EE); (b) Depersonalization (Dp); and (c) Personal Accomplishment (PA) (Maslach et al., 1996).

Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI-HSS)

Maslach et al. (1996) described their inventory as being designed to assess the three aspects of the burnout syndrome: Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and reduced Personal Accomplishment. The Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale, consisting of nine items, assesses feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one's work. Individuals who work in the helping professions may sometimes feel overloaded and overinvolved emotionally. They often feel that they are overextending themselves and this may lead to them feeling overwhelmed by all the emotional demands.
of their vocation or current situation. This, in turn, may lead to high levels of Emotional Exhaustion. Persons with a high level of Emotional Exhaustion tend to feel very tired, empty, and without the needed energy to get through each day. They may feel that their emotional resources are drained without any possible source of replenishment. This pattern of feeling emotionally overloaded and subsequently emotionally exhausted is at the heart of the burnout syndrome (Maslach et al., 1996).

The Depersonalization (DP) subscale, consisting of five items, measures an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of one's service, care, treatment, or instruction. Once a high level of Emotional Exhaustion is reached, then people feel they are no longer able to give of themselves to others, which leads to this second aspect of the burnout syndrome, Depersonalization. To protect themselves, many people in the helping professions try to reduce the level of their emotional burden by cutting back on their interaction with others. They feel that reducing this contact to a bare minimum will protect them from any further emotional pain. This pattern of behavior may explain why some of these people become ‘petty bureaucrats’—going strictly by the book in dealing with their service recipients. They begin to stereotype and categorize these recipients rather than deal with them individually.

The solution to this dilemma involves applying a formula rather than becoming personally involved thus keeping themselves isolated and detached from their charges. This isolation and detachment puts some emotional distance between oneself and the overwhelming needs and demands of the people they serve. One disadvantage to this armor of detachment, although it may indeed shield the individual,
is that is may block all feeling for others. Maslach et al. (1996) reported a story told to them by a New York policeman:

You change when you become a cop—you become tough and hard and cynical. You have to condition yourself to be that way in order to survive this job. And sometimes, without realizing it, you act that way all the time, even with your wife and kids. But it's something you have to do because if you start getting emotionally involved with what happens at work, you'll wind up in Bellevue [psychiatric hospital]. (p. 4)

This experience reflects how the caregiver attempts to react to protect himself/herself from the pain of being personally involved with the recipients of his/her services.

A result of Depersonalization manifests itself in negative feelings towards those who cause Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization. These negative feelings about others sometimes progress until it causes caregivers to feel down about themselves. They often feel guilty and distressed about how they mishandle others. They begin to feel that somehow they are becoming cold and uncaring, the exact type of individual that they do not want to be. These feelings represent an arrival at the third stage of burnout—feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. Providers feel inadequate about their inability to relate to others in a caring manner and thus feel like a failure.

The Personal Accomplishment (PA) subscale, consisting of eight items, assesses feelings of competence and successful achievement in one's work with people. The frequency that the respondent experiences feelings related to each subscale is assessed using a 6-point, fully anchored response format. It is recommended to report Personal Accomplishment as direct computations of item scores rather than as
Diminished Personal Accomplishment based upon reversed items (Maslach et al., 1996).

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. A high degree of burnout is reflected in high scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. An average/moderate degree of burnout is reflected in averages scores on the three subscales. A low degree of burnout is reflected in low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in high scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale.

At present, scores are considered high if they are in the upper third of the normative distribution, average if they are in the middle third, and low if they are in the lower third. Furthermore, given the limited knowledge about the relationships between the three aspects of burnout, the scores for each subscale are considered separately and are not combined into a single, total score. Thus, three scores are computed for each respondent.

Recent theorizing has considered the state that is the opposite of burnout, one in which low emotional exhaustion and depersonalization are combined with high levels of personal accomplishment, to be indicative of engagement with work. This opposite state provides a definite contrast to burnout and a positive goal for interventions.
MBI-HSS Reliability

According to Maslach et al. (1996), reliability coefficients reported were based on samples that were not used in the item selections to avoid any improper inflation of the reliability estimates. Internal consistency was estimated by Cronbach's coefficient alpha \( (n = 1,316) \). The reliability coefficients for the subscales were the following: .90 for Emotional Exhaustion, .79 for Depersonalization, and .71 for Personal Accomplishment. The standard error of measurement for each subscale is as follows: 3.80 for Emotional Exhaustion, 3.16 for Depersonalization, and 3.73 for Personal Accomplishment.

Data on test-retest reliability of the MBI-HSS have been reported for five samples. For a sample of graduate students in social welfare, and administrators in a health agency \((n = 53)\), the two test sessions were separated by an interval of 2 to 4 weeks. The test-retest reliability coefficients for the subscales were the following: .82 for Emotional Exhaustion, .60 for Depersonalization, and .80 for Personal Accomplishment. Although these coefficients range from low to moderately high, all are significant beyond the .001 level. In a sample of 248 teachers, the two test sessions were separated by an interval of 1 year. The test-retest reliability scores for the three subscales were the following: .60 for Emotional Exhaustion, .54 for Depersonalization, and .57 for Personal Accomplishment (Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986).

Lee and Ashforth (1993) found test-retest correlations of .74, .72, and .65, respectively, for an 8-month interval. Maslach and Leiter (1997) found test-retest correlations of .59, .50, and .63 on a 6-month interval. Leiter and Durup (1996) found test-retest correlations of .75, .64, and .62, respectively, for a 3-month interval. Although the
values do not differ strikingly, note that for most of these five studies the highest test-retest correlation is for emotional exhaustion. Overall, longitudinal studies of the MBI-HSS have found a high degree of consistency within each subscale that does not seem to diminish markedly from a period of 1 month to a year. This stability is consistent with the MBI-HSS’s purpose of measuring an enduring state.

Internal consistency and test-retest reliability coefficients are given in Table 1.

The coefficient alpha and the short-term test-retest coefficient are quite good. Four of the larger term coefficients are rather low.

Table 1

*Reliability of MBI-HSS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient α (n = 1.316)</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test-Retest</td>
<td>Graduate students, administrators, and teachers</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. n = 53 (2-4 weeks)</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. n = 248 (1 year)</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. (8 months)</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. (6 months)</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. (3 months)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MBI-HSS Validity

Maslach et al. (1996) reported that the MBI-HSS's validity has been well demonstrated. Convergent validity was demonstrated in several ways. First, an individual's MBI-HSS scores were correlated with behavioral ratings made independently by a person who knew the individual well, such as a spouse or co-worker. Second, MBI-HSS scores were correlated with the presence of certain job characteristics that were expected to contribute to experiencing burnout. Third, MBI-HSS scores were correlated with measures of various outcomes that had been hypothesized to be related to burnout. All three sets of correlations provided substantial evidence for the validity of the MBI-HSS.

Human Services Demographic Questionnaire

An edited version of the Human Services Demographic Questionnaire was given to participants, asking that they supply personal and organizational information at the time of completing the MBI-HSS. The questions included: gender, age, ethnic origin, marital status, highest educational degree earned, years of pastoral experience, church size, number of children, and length of time at present assignment.

Null Hypotheses and Statistical Analysis

The following 16 null hypotheses stem from the five research questions previously addressed in chapter 1:

1. There is no significant correlation between scores on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables.
2. There is no significant correlation between scores on the Depersonalization (Dp) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables.

3. There is no significant correlation between scores on the Personal Achievement (PA) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables.

4. There is no significant difference between mean scores of those with different degree levels on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale.

5. There is no significant difference between mean scores of those with different degree levels on the Depersonalization (Dp) subscale.

6. There is no significant difference between mean scores of those with different degree levels on the Personal Achievement (PA) subscale.

7. There is no significant multiple correlation between Emotional Exhaustion (EE) and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables, not including educational level.

8. There is no significant multiple correlation between Depersonalization (Dp) and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables, not including educational level.

9. There is no significant multiple correlation between Personal Achievement (PA) and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables, not including educational level.

10. There is no significant canonical correlation between a linear combination of the three burnout subscales, and a linear combination of the 12 independent variables, not including educational level.

Each of the null hypotheses 1 to 3 was tested by Pearson Product-Moment
Correlation Coefficient. Each of the null hypotheses 4 to 6 was tested by one-way ANOVA. Each of the null hypotheses 7 to 9 was tested by Multiple Linear Regression Analysis. Null hypothesis 10 was tested by Canonical Correlation Analysis. All hypotheses were tested with an alpha at .05. Each of the 16 null hypotheses is presented along with the appropriate statistical analysis.

Further analysis was undertaken using the groupings' high burnout test scores, medium burnout test scores, low burnout test scores, for each of the three burnout subscales. The hypotheses relating to these analyses are as follows:

11. There is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group, the Average/Medium Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group, and the Low Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group.

12. There is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Depersonalization (Dp) group, the Average/Medium Depersonalization (Dp) group, and the Low Depersonalization (Dp) group.

13. There is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Personal Accomplishment (PA) group, the Average/Medium Personal Accomplishment (PA) group, and the Low Personal Accomplishment (PA) group.

14. There is no linear combination of the 12 demographic variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings of Emotional Exhaustion (EE).
15. There is no linear combination of the 12 demographic variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings of Depersonalization (Dp).

16. There is no linear combination of the 12 demographic variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings of Reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).

Each of the null hypotheses 11 to 13 was tested by one-way ANOVA. Each of the null hypotheses 14-16 was tested by Discriminant Analysis. All hypotheses were tested with an alpha at .05. Each of the 16 null hypotheses is presented along with the appropriate statistical analysis.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents descriptive data relating to the sample. It also presents the results of testing the hypotheses.

Description of Sample

The sample for this study consisted of 130 Adventist ministers from the North American Division of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Participation in the study was completely voluntary. The convenience sample was obtained by asking permission of the president of the Arizona Conference of the Seventh-day Adventists to allow me to ask the ministers employed in the conference to participate in this study. The research packets (the Demographic Questionnaire and the Maslach Burnout Inventory) were distributed to various workers' meetings and camp meetings. Although a total of 150 research packets was distributed, 6 packets were not used due to the subject's choice to not participate, and 14 packets were not used due to the improper completion of instruments by the subjects, which left the total number of participants to be 130 (N = 130).
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Demographic Data

Table 2 presents a description of the sample in terms of gender. The findings indicate that the majority of the participants were male (96.9%) and 3.1% were female. Table 3 presents a description of the sample in terms of age. These findings indicate that, of the 130 total participants, 7% were between the ages of 25-30 and 16% were between the ages of 31-39. There were 24% between the ages of 40-49 and 29% between the ages of 50-59. The sample also contained 27% between the ages of 60-69 and 3% 70 and over.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents a description of the sample in terms of marital status. The findings indicate that the majority of the participants were married (94.6%) and 7% were single, divorced, widowed, and other. Table 5 presents a description of the sample in terms of ethnic origin. These findings indicate that just over 56.2% of the participants were Caucasian, 11.5% were Asian American, 15.4% were African American, 2.3% were Native American, and 9.2% were Hispanic.
Table 4

*Marital Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Ethnic Origin*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 presents a description of the sample in terms of years married. The findings indicate that 18.5% of the participants were married between 0-10 years, 26.9% were married between 11-20 years, 29.2% were married between 21-30 years, and 13.9% were married between 31-40 years. The findings also found that 11.5% were married 40 or more years. Table 7 presents a description of the sample in terms of number of children. These findings indicate that 51 of the participants (39.2%) reported having no children, 30 of those reporting (23.1%) had one child, 31.5% of the sample reported having two children, and 6.2% reported three children.

Table 6

*Years Married*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and over</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 presents a description of the sample in terms of highest level of education attained. The findings indicate the highest level of education completed by the participants with 1.5% completing some college, 18.5% completing 4 years of college, 66.2% completing some post-graduate, and 13.8% completing other. Table 9 presents a description of the sample in terms of highest degree earned. The findings indicate that 1 or 0.8% earned an Associate Degree, 32 or 24.6% earned a Bachelor’s Degree, 28 or 21.5% earned a Master’s Degree, 4 or 3.1% earned a Ph.D. Degree, 2 or 1.5% earned a Ed.D. Degree, 55 or 42.3% earned a M.Div. Degree, and 8 or 6.2% earned a D.Min. Degree.
Table 8

*Highest Level Completed*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Years College</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Post-Graduate</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

*Highest Degree Earned*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Degree</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. Degree</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Div. Degree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.Min. Degree</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 presents a description of the sample in terms of the primary area of work.

The findings indicate that 9 or 6.9% were Administrators, 101 or 77.7% were Ordained Ministers, 16 or 12.3% were Un-ordained Ministers, 1 or 2.3% was an Un-ordained Department Leader, and 3 or 2.3% were Ordained Department Leaders.

Table 11 presents a description of the primary position held by the participants. The findings indicate that 3 or 2.3% were Staff Members, 79 or 60.8% were Supervising Pastors, 15 or 11.5% were Administrators, 4 or 3.1% were Interns, 27 or 20.8% were Licenced Ministers, and 2 or 1.5% were Other.

Table 10

*Primary Area of Work*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordained Minister</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-ordained Minister</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Un-ordained leader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Ordained Leader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 11

*Primary Position Held*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Pastor</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Minister</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 presents a description of the sample in terms of the number of congregations. The findings indicate that 14 or 10.8% had zero congregations, 58 or 44.6% had one congregation, 45 or 34.6% had two congregations, 8 or 6.2% had three congregations, and 5 or 3.8% had four congregations. Table 13 presents a description of the sample in terms of the number of members. These findings indicate that 23 or 17.7% had between 0-100 members, 30 or 23.1% had between 101-199 members, 25 or 19.2% had between 200-299 members, 20 or 15.5% had between 300-399 members, 11 or 8.4% had between 400-499 members, 10 or 7.7% had between 500-699 members, and 11 or 8.4% had between 700-1,200 members.
Table 12

*Number of Congregations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

*Numbers of Members*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-199</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>08.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-699</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700-1200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>08.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14 presents a description of the sample in terms of the number of moves. The findings indicate that 71 or 54.6% moved between 0-5 times, 45 or 34.6% moved between 6-10 times, 9 or 7.0% moved between 11-15 times, 3 or 2.3% moved between 16-20 times, and 2 or 1.5% moved 21 or more times. Table 15 presents a description of the sample in terms of how long in the present position. The findings indicate that 93 or 71.5% were between 0-5 years, 19 or 14.7% were between 6-10 years, 10 or 7.6% were between 11-15 years, and 8 or 6.2% were 16 years or more.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Moves</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

*How Long in Present Position*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 and over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 presents a description of the sample in terms of length of employment. The findings indicate that 28 or 21.5% were between 1-10 years, 49 or 37.7% were between 11-20 years, 20 or 15.4% were between 21-29 years, 22 or 16.9% were between 30-39 years, and 11 or 8.5% were 40 years or over. Table 17 presents a description of the sample in terms of counseling. The findings indicate that 71 or 54.6% reported having received counseling and 59 or 45.4% reported not having received counseling.
Table 16

**Length of Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and over</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

**Counseling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 18 presents a description of the sample in terms of hours spent per week on the job. The findings indicate that 3 or 2.3% reported working between 1-20 hours a week, 36 or 27.7% reported working between 21-49 hours a week, 74 or 56.9% reported working between 50-69 hours a week, and 17 or 13.1% reported working 70 or more hours a week. Table 19 presents a description of the sample in terms of hours with family. The findings indicate that 52 or 40.0% reported between 1-10 hours a week, 58 or 44.6% reported between 11-20 hours a week, and 20 or 15.4% reported between 21-30 hours a week.

Table 18

*Weekly Hours on the Job*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19  

*Hours With Family*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Testing the Hypotheses**

Each of the 16 null hypotheses is presented along with the appropriate statistical analysis. Each of the null hypotheses 1 to 3 was tested by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Each of the null hypotheses 4 to 6 was tested by one-way ANOVA. Each of the null hypotheses 7 to 9 was tested by Multiple Linear Regression Analysis. Null hypothesis 10 was tested by Canonical Correlation Analysis. Each of the null hypotheses 11, 12, and 13 was tested by one-way ANOVA. Each of the null hypotheses 14, 15, and 16 was tested by discriminant analysis. All hypotheses were tested with an alpha at .05.

**Null Hypothesis 1**

*Null Hypothesis 1.* There is no significant correlation between scores on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables.
Null Hypothesis 2

*Null Hypothesis 2.* There is no significant correlation between scores on the Depersonalization (Dp) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables.

Null Hypothesis 3

*Null Hypothesis 3.* There is no significant correlation between scores on the Personal Achievement (PA) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables.

These three hypotheses were tested by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Table 20 gives the correlations for all three hypotheses. In relation to null hypothesis 1, 3 of the 12 variables yielded a significant correlation with Emotional Exhaustion (EE). The positive correlation between spirituality and Emotional Exhaustion (EE) indicates that greater spirituality tends to be correlated to greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE). A correlation also was found with fewer hours spent with family and greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores. Also, the lower the number of members, the greater the Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

The positive correlation between years married and Depersonalization (Dp) indicates that the greater the number of years married tends to be related to greater Depersonalization (Dp). Also, the fewer the number of members, then the greater the Depersonalization (Dp). The negative correlation between spirituality and Personal Accomplishment (PA) indicates that those who rated themselves as having greater spirituality tend to be related to greater Personal Accomplishment (PA). Fewer children in the family is correlated with higher Personal Accomplishment (PA) scores. Also, the more hours on the job, then the greater the Personal Accomplishment (PA).
Table 20

*Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.282*</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.302*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Married</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.174*</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.299*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Job</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.174*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Family</td>
<td>-.375*</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Present Employment</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Employed</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Congregations</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Members</td>
<td>-.255*</td>
<td>-.203*</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Moves</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05.
Information from the correlation matrix, when analyzed, suggested the following:

Those who obtained higher scores in Emotional Exhaustion (EE) also reported to a significant degree greater spirituality. Those ministers with less time with the family obtained higher Emotional Exhaustion (Ee) scores. Ministers who reported fewer number of church members also scored higher on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale.

The study found that ministers reporting greater number of years married were positively related to Depersonalization (Dp). It also found that the fewer the number of members, then the greater the Depersonalization (Dp) scores. Ministers who rated themselves as having higher spirituality were more likely to exhibit greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). Those ministers who reported having fewer children also showed feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). The study also found that ministers who reported more hours on the job tended to have greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).

Null Hypothesis 4

*Null Hypothesis 4.* There is no significant difference between mean scores of those with different degree levels on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale.

This null hypothesis was tested by One-Way ANOVA. Table 21 presents the means for Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale. Table 22 presents the results of the analysis of variance. Null hypothesis 4 was retained. There is no significance difference between Emotional Exhaustion (EE) on any of the 12 independent variables of those with different degrees.
Table 21

*Means Table for Emotional Exhaustion (EE)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EE Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s (other)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Div.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.4528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16.1525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*Summary of the Analysis of Variance for Emotional Exhaustion (EE) Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EE Score</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Level of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>500.6667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166.889</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9866.588</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>86.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10367.254</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05.
Null Hypothesis 5

_Null Hypothesis 5._ There is no significant difference between mean scores on the Depersonalization (Dp) subscale of subjects on any of the 12 independent variables of subjects with different levels of educational degrees. This null hypothesis was tested by One-Way ANOVA. Table 23 presents the means for Depersonalization (Dp) subscale. Table 24 presents the results of the analysis of variance. Null hypothesis 5 was retained. There is no significant difference between the mean scores on the Depersonalization (Dp) subscale of subjects with different levels of educational degrees.

Table 23

_Means Table for Depersonalization (Dp)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dp Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.6538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's (other)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.4800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Div.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>5.5508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24

*Summary of the Analysis of Variance for Depersonalization (Dp) Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dp Score</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Level of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>42.564</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.188</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2532.631</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>22.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2575.195</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05.

Null Hypothesis 6

*Null Hypothesis 6.* There is no significant difference between mean scores on the Personal Accomplishment (PA) subscale of subjects with different levels of degree.

This null hypothesis was tested by One-Way ANOVA. Table 25 presents the means for Personal Accomplishment (PA) subscale. Table 26 presents the results of the analysis of variance. Null hypothesis 6 was rejected. Because of the very different group sizes of frequencies, a post hoc Scheffé test was used to compare the group means. As this test is so conservative, an alpha of .10 was used, as recommended by Scheffé (Scheffé, 1959). This tested indicated that those with a Doctorate degree have significantly higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) scores than those with a Bachelor’s and Master’s (other) Degree.
Table 25

*Means Table for Personal Accomplishment (PA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA Score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.4231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's (other)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorates</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.8571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Div.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32.1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>32.1780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

*Summary of the Analysis of Variance for Personal Accomplishment (PA) Score*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA Score</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Level of Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>790.970</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>263.657</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td>.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>10648.293</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>93.406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11439.263</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05.
Null Hypothesis 7

Null Hypothesis 7. There is no significant multiple correlation between Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables, with the exception of educational level. This null hypothesis was tested by stepwise regression analysis. Five steps were taken by the program. The combination of 5 variables yielded a multiple correlation of .5176. This gives $R^2 = .2679$, which indicates that .2679 of the variance of Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores is related to the linear combination of the 5 variables. Table 27 gives the regression coefficients for the variables. Null hypothesis 7 was rejected.

Table 27

Regression Coefficients for Null Hypothesis 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error of Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.2135</td>
<td>0.0820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>1.8745</td>
<td>0.8968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours family</td>
<td>-0.3950</td>
<td>0.1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of members</td>
<td>-0.721</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of moves</td>
<td>-0.6042</td>
<td>0.1936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This analysis indicated that the minister who is older, who has rated himself/herself as having greater spirituality, spends fewer hours with the family, has fewer members, and has had fewer moves tends to experience greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores.

Null Hypothesis 8

Null Hypothesis 8. There is no significant multiple correlation between Depersonalization (Dp) and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables.

This null hypothesis was tested by stepwise regression analysis. Only one step was taken by the program. The addition of no other variables to the number of members significantly increased the correlation. The variable yielded a multiple correlation of .2025 ($R^2 = .0410$). Table 28 gives the regression coefficients for the variables.

Table 28

Regression Coefficients for Null Hypothesis 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error of Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Members</td>
<td>-0.387</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis indicated that the lower the number of members, then the greater is likely to be the Depersonalization (Dp). No further variables were added.
Null Hypothesis 9

*Null Hypothesis 9.* There is no significant multiple correlation between Personal Accomplishment (PA) scores and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables, not including educational level.

This null hypothesis was tested by stepwise regression analysis. Four steps were taken by the program. The combination of 4 variables yielded a multiple correlation of 0.5113 ($R^2 = .2614$). Table 29 gives the regression coefficients for the variables.

Table 29

*Regression Coefficients for Null Hypothesis 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error of Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.2289</td>
<td>0.0680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>-3.1480</td>
<td>0.8223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>-3.5868</td>
<td>0.8267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours on Job</td>
<td>0.1443</td>
<td>0.0539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This analysis indicated that greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) tend to be related to being younger, having rated themselves as having lower spirituality, fewer children, and spending more hours on the job.
Null Hypothesis 10

*Null Hypothesis 10.* There is no significant canonical correlation between a linear combination of the three burnout subscales and a linear combination of the 12 independent variables, not including educational level.

Table 30

*Canonical Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 1 Variables</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.816 (1)</td>
<td>0.463 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>-0.656 (2)</td>
<td>0.755 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 2 Variables</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
<th>Function 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>0.637 (1)</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Married</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>0.332 (4)</td>
<td>-0.449 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours on Job</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>0.305 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours with Family</td>
<td>-0.584 (2)</td>
<td>-0.402 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Present Employment</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Employed</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.351 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Congregations</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Members</td>
<td>-0.436 (3)</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moves</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-0.261 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The canonical analysis yielded two significant canonical functions. The first function yielded a canonical correlation of .6030. The weights of the variables in the two sets for this function are shown in the first column of Table 30. Including those variables whose weight is at least 50% of the greatest weight in that set, this first function indicated that the minister who rated themselves as having higher spirituality, fewer hours with the family, fewer members, and more children tended to have higher scores on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scale and lower scores on the reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) scale.

The second function yielded a canonical correlation of 0.4941. The weights of the variables in the two sets for this function are shown in the second column of Table 30. Including those variables whose weights were at least 50% of the greatest weight in that set, this second function indicated that the minister with fewer children, fewer hours with the family, employed for less time, spending more hours on the job, and having fewer moves tends to have higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores and more feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).

Further analysis was undertaken using the groupings' high burnout test scores, medium burnout test scores, and low burnout test scores, for each of the three burnout subscales. Null hypotheses 11-16, relating to these analyses, are presented as follows:

Null Hypothesis 11

Null Hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Emotional Exhaustion
(EE) group, the Average/Medium Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group, and the Low Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group.

Table 31 gives, for each of the 12 variables, the mean of the three stress groupings (Low burnout test scores, Average/Medium burnout test scores, and High burnout test scores), and the results of the Analysis of Variance. The table indicates that significant differences are present for 4 of these variables. The Scheffé test with an alpha of .10 was used, as recommended by Scheffé (Scheffé, 1959). This test compares pairs of group means on each of these variables. The results are as follows:

1. **Spirituality:** In relation to spirituality, Group 3 (High burnout test scores) shows significantly higher self-rated spirituality scores than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores).

2. **Hours With the Family:** In relation to less hours with the family, Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) is significantly higher than Group 3 (High burnout test scores), and Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores) is significantly higher than Group 3 (High burnout test scores).

3. **Time Present Employment:** In relation to more time in present employment, Group 3 (High burnout test scores) is significantly higher than Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores).

4. **Number of Members:** In relation to less members, Group 3 (High burnout test scores) is significantly lower than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) or Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores).
Table 31

Means Table for 12 Variables and the Three Stress Grouping and ANOVAs of Emotional Exhaustion (EE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>49.70</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrMar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.44</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumCh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HrsWk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53.86</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53.22</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HrsFa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.031</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 31—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TiPre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmpT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.32</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuCon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.798</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuMe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>319.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>319.32</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.069</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>146.72</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>295.47</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuMo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05.*
Null Hypothesis 12

*Null Hypothesis 12.* There is no significant difference among the mean scores, on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Depersonalization (Dp) group, the Average/Medium Depersonalization (Dp) group, and the Low Depersonalization (Dp) group.

Table 32 gives, for each of the 12 variables, the mean of the three stress groupings (Low burnout test scores, Average/Medium burnout test scores, and High burnout test scores), and the results of the Analysis of Variance. The table indicates that significant differences are present for 3 of these variables. The Scheffé test with an alpha of .10 was used, as recommended by Scheffé (Scheffé, 1959). This test compares pairs of group means on each of these variables. The results are as follows:

1. *Hours With the Family:* In relation to less hours with the family, Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) is significantly higher than Group 3 (High burnout test scores).

2. *Number of Congregations:* In relation to more congregations, Group 3 (High burnout test scores) is significantly lower than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) or Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores).

3. *Number of Members:* In relation to less number of members, Group 1 is significantly higher than Group 3.
Table 32

*Means Table for 12 Variables and the Three Stress Grouping and ANOVAs of Depersonalization (Dp)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.13</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.31</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spir</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrMar</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumCh</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HrsWk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>54.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.77</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.46</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HrsFa</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 32—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TiPre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmpT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.67</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuCon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuMe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>325.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>288.93</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>110.46</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>295.47</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuMo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05.
Null Hypothesis 13

Null Hypothesis 13. There is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Personal Accomplishment (PA) group, the Average/Medium Personal Accomplishment (PA) group, and the Low Personal Accomplishment (PA) group.

Table 33 gives, for each of the 12 variables, the mean of the three stress groupings (Low burnout test scores, Average/Medium burnout test scores, and High burnout test scores), and the results of the Analysis of Variance. The table indicates that significant differences are present for 2 of these variables. The Scheffé test with an alpha of .10 was used, as recommended by Scheffé (Scheffé, 1959). This test compares pairs of group means on each of these variables. The results are as follows:

1. Spirituality: In relation to those who rated themselves as having greater spirituality, Group 3 (High burnout test scores) is significantly higher than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores).

2. Number of Children: In relation to more children, Group 3 (High burnout test scores) is significantly higher than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores).
Table 33

Means Table for 12 Variables and the Three Stress Grouping and ANOVAs of Personal Accomplishment (PA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spir</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YrMar</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>22.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NumCh</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HrsWk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>55.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HrsFa</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TiPre</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EmpT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuCon</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 33—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NuMe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>326.41</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>244.33</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>295.47</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NuMo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReCo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05.

Null Hypothesis 14

Null Hypothesis 14. There is no linear combination of the 12 demographic variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings (Low burnout test scores, Average/Medium burnout test scores, and High burnout test scores) of Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Null Hypothesis 14 was tested by discriminant analysis. There is one significant function.
Table 34 presents the discriminant function means for the variables on Function 1. Table 35 presents the structure matrix for these variables, i.e., the correlation between the variable and the discriminant function. Following a common convention, I have considered those variables whose correlations are at least 50% of the maximum correlation. These are then ranked 1 to 3. These findings indicate that a randomly selected minister who has fewer hours with family, rated themselves as having higher spirituality, and fewer members is more likely to be in the high stress group on Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Table 34

Function 1 Null Hypothesis 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 35

*Structure Matrix Null Hypothesis 14-Function 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours with Family</td>
<td>.596* (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>-.414* (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.144*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Present</td>
<td>-.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Members</td>
<td>.333 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Congregations</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Married</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moves</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Time</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Per Week</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Counseling</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p = .05$. 
Null Hypothesis 15

Null Hypothesis 15. There is no linear combination of the 12 demographic variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings (Low burnout test scores, Average/Medium burnout test scores, and High burnout test scores) of Depersonalization (Dp). Null hypothesis 15 was tested by discriminant analysis. There is one significant function.

Function 1 Null Hypothesis 15

Table 36 presents the discriminant function means for the variables on Function 1. Table 37 presents the structure matrix for these variables, i.e., the correlation between the variable and the discriminant function. Following a common convention, I have considered those variables whose correlations are at least 50% of the maximum correlation. These are then ranked 1 to 3. These findings indicate that a randomly selected minister who has fewer congregations, fewer members, and fewer hours with family is more likely to have high Depersonalization (Dp).

Table 36

Function 1 Null Hypothesis 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 37

*Structure Matrix Null Hypothesis 15-Function 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Congregations</td>
<td>-.578 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Members</td>
<td>-.415 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours with Family</td>
<td>-.343 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Per Week</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Present</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Time</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moves</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Married</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Counseling</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null Hypothesis 16

*Null Hypothesis 16.* There is no linear combination of the 12 demographic variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings (Low burnout test scores, Average/Medium burnout test scores, and High burnout test scores) of Reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). Null Hypothesis 16 was tested by discriminant analysis. There is one significant function.

Function 1 Null Hypothesis 16

Table 38 presents the discriminant function means for the variables on Function 1. Table 39 presents the structure matrix for these variables, i.e., the correlation between the variable and the discriminant function. Following a common convention, I have considered those variables whose correlations are at least 50% of the maximum correlation. These are then ranked 1 to 2. These findings indicate that a randomly selected minister with more children and who have rated themselves as having greater spirituality is more likely to have greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).

Table 38

*Function 1 Null Hypothesis 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 39

Structure Matrix Null Hypothesis 16-Function 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Function 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>.520 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>.515 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Members</td>
<td>-.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Present</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Counseling</td>
<td>-.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Moves</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Per Week</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Married</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Time</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours With Family</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Congregations</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Sixteen null hypotheses were examined in this study. Null Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3 were tested by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Null Hypothesis 1 yielded the following results: The positive correlation between spirituality and Emotional Exhaustion (EE) indicated that those who rated themselves as having greater spirituality tended to be related to higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores; the fewer the hours spent with the family the higher the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores; and the lower the number of members the greater the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores.

Null Hypothesis 2 yielded the following results: The positive correlation between years married and Depersonalization (Dp) indicates that greater number of years married tends to be related to greater Depersonalization (Dp). Also, the lower the number of members, then the greater the Depersonalization (Dp). The positive correlation between spirituality and reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) indicates that those who rated themselves as having greater spirituality tends to be related to greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). Fewer children in the family tended to be related with higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). Also, the more hours on the job, then the greater the feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).

Null Hypothesis 3 yielded the following results: The positive correlation between spirituality and reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) indicated that greater spirituality tended to be related to less reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA); the lower the number of children, then the greater the reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA); and the more hours spent on the job, then the greater the reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).

Null Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6 were tested by One-Way ANOVA. Null Hypotheses...
4 and 5 were retained. Null Hypothesis 6 was rejected. Because of the very different group sizes of frequencies, a post hoc Scheffé test was used to compare the group means. As this test is so conservative, an alpha of .10 was used, as recommended by Scheffé (Scheffé, 1959). This tested indicated that ministers with a Doctorate degree have significantly higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) than those with a Bachelor’s and Master’s Degrees.

Null Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9 were tested by stepwise regression analysis. Null Hypothesis 7 produced the following results: five steps were taken by the program; the combination of 5 variables yielded a multiple correlation of .5176 ($R^2 = .2679$); and the minister who is older, who has rated himself/herself as having greater spirituality, spends fewer hours with the family, has fewer members, and has had fewer moves tends to experience greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Null Hypothesis 8 produced the following results: Only one step was taken by the program; the addition of no other variables to number of members significantly increased the correlation; the variable yielded a multiple correlation of .2025 ($R^2 = .0410$); and this analysis indicated that the lower the number of members, then the greater the Depersonalization (Dp) will be. Null Hypothesis 9 produced the following results: Four steps were taken by the program; the combination of 4 variables yielded a multiple correlation of 0.5113 ($R^2 = .2614$); and this analysis indicated that higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) tend to be related to being younger, who has rated themselves as having lower spirituality, fewer children, and spending more hours on the job.
Null Hypothesis 10 was tested by canonical analysis and yielded two significant canonical functions. The first function yielded a canonical correlation of .6030 and indicated that the minister who rated themselves as having higher spirituality, fewer hours with the family, fewer members, and more children tends to have higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores and lower feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). The second function yielded a canonical correlation of 0.4941 and indicated that the minister with fewer children, fewer hours with family, employed less time, more hours on job, and fewer moves tends to have lower feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) and higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Null Hypotheses 11, 12, and 13 were tested by one-way ANOVA. Null Hypothesis 11 yielded the following results: Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly higher self-rated spirituality scores than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores); Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) showed significantly higher hours with family than Group 3 (High burnout test scores), and Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores) showed significantly higher hours with family than Group 3 (High burnout test scores); Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly higher time with present employment than Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores); and Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly lower number of members than Groups 1 (Low burnout test scores) or 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores).

Null Hypothesis 12 yielded the following results: Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) showed significantly higher number of congregations than Group 3 (High burnout test scores); Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly lower number of congregations than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores); Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly lower number of
congregations than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) or Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores); and Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) showed significantly higher number of members than Group 3 (High burnout test scores). Null Hypothesis 13 yielded the following results: Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly higher self-rated spirituality scores than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores); and Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly higher number of children than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores).

Hypotheses 14, 15, and 16 were tested by discriminant analysis. Null Hypothesis 14 yielded one significant function and the findings indicated that a randomly selected minister who has fewer hours with family, who rated himself/herself as having higher spirituality, and fewer members is more likely to be in Group 3 (High burnout test scores) on Emotional Exhaustion (EE). Null Hypothesis 15 yielded one significant function and the findings indicated that a randomly selected minister who has fewer congregations, fewer members, and fewer hours with family is more likely to have high Depersonalization (Dp). Null Hypothesis 16 yielded one significant function, and the findings indicated that a randomly selected minister with more children and who rated himself/herself as having greater spirituality is more likely to have greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the problem, purpose of the study, methodology, and demographics. Next, the results of this study are organized under the null hypotheses where the results are summarized and discussed. Finally, conclusions are drawn, recommendations for future research are made, and implications for practice are suggested.

Summary

Problem

Many Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) ministers complain that they experience high levels of stress in their ministries and that they find it difficult to function optimally under these circumstances (Pandjaitan, 1999). Such stress most likely has a negative effect on their productivity and on their influence in their congregations. Others experience serious complications, such as having a heart attack, leaving the ministry due to sheer exhaustion, having an affair that will force the pastor to abandon his or her career, and/or having other serious breakdowns in one’s family relationships. All of the above may lead them to
terminate their work as ministers (Pandjaitan, 1999).

Reinhold (1996) stated that burnout happens when the stresses are too strong and the rewards too few. Too much stress, overwork, unrealistic expectations, role conflicts, and fatigue all take their toll on clergy (Pines et al., 1981). Recent studies (Davey, 1995; Rediger, 1993; Wallstrom, 1990) document clergy burnout. Based on personal experience, it appears that clergy in the SDA church are, in several ways, more regulated than their colleagues in other denominations such as: (a) they are employed exclusively by the church and can have no other employment; (b) it is desirable that the SDA pastor be married, unlike their Catholic colleagues; and (c) dietary, moral, and spiritual constraints are strict and demand that SDA pastors abstain from gambling, drinking, smoking, wearing jewelry, and indulging in other mundane pursuits (General Conference Working Policy, 1997).

Few studies have addressed burnout among SDA clergy. More information would aid in finding out how burnout affects the SDA clergy, given the fact that they have several points of difference between them and other nominal clergy. It may be interesting to examine whether the differences mentioned above have any effect on burnout levels among the Adventist clergy.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine (a) the burnout levels of pastors in the SDA denomination and, (b) the nature and the relationship, if any, among the following 12 independent variables: Age, Spirituality, Years Married, Number of Children, Hours
on the Job, Hours With the Family, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Members, Number of Moves, and Counseling (excluded variables included Gender, Marital Status, Highest Level of Education Completed, Primary Area of Work, Primary Position Held, Years of Pastoral Experience, and Ethnicity).

Methodology

This research explored the relationships between pastoral burnout and age, highest educational degree earned, years of service, church size, number of children, number of moves, number of years married, number of congregations served, number of hours spent with the family, and number of hours per week spent on the job. It was conducted using a survey method in which pastors, in selected conferences, were requested to respond to two questionnaires: the Pastoral Services Demographic Data Sheet (PSDDS) and the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach et al., 1996).

The correlation matrix of a regression correlation analysis was used to explore the interrelationships among age, highest educational degree earned, years of service, church size, number of children, number of moves, number of years married, number of congregations served, number of hours spent with the family, number of hours per week spent on the job, and burnout. Multiple regression was used to study the relationship between pastoral burnout and each of the variables mentioned. A multiple regression analysis was also used to determine the strongest model of the combination of these variables in relation to burnout and to establish their relative importance in the model.
Demographics

Regarding the demographics, the majority of the participants were male (96.9%), between the ages of 40-69 (80%), married (94.6%), married for between 11-30 years (56.1%), and with one child or more (54.6%). In terms of ethnic origin, 56.2% of the participants were Caucasian, 15.4% were African American, 11.5% were Asian American, 9.2% were Hispanic, and 2.3% were Native American.

The findings indicated that most subjects (66.2%) completed some post-graduate studies. The study also found that 42.3% of the subjects completed a M.Div. Degree, 21.5% completed a Master’s Degree, and 24.6% completed a Bachelor’s Degree. The remaining subjects (11.6%) were spread across several types of degrees including Associate’s Degree, Ed.D., D.Min., and Ph.D. The participants reported that 77.7% were Ordained Ministers, 60.8% were Supervising Pastors, 1.5% were Administrators, 3.1% were Interns, and 20.8% were Licensed Ministers. Almost half of the participants (44.6%) reported having one congregation, while 44.6% reported having two or more congregations. The remaining 10.8% reported having zero congregations.

In terms of congregation size, 17.7% reported having congregations between 0-100 members, 23.1% between 101-199 members, 9.2% between 200-299 members, 15.5% between 300-399 members, and 24.5% between 400-1,200 members. As far as the number of moves, 54.6% moved between 0-5 times and 34.6% moved between 6-10 times. Most of the participants (71.5%) reported being in their present position for between 0-5 years. Participants also reported that 21.5% were employed between 1-10 years and 37.7% were employed between 11-20 years. The description of the sample, in terms of counseling,
indicated that 54.6% reported having received counseling and 45.4% reported not having received counseling.

In relation to the hours on the job, 27.7% reported working between 21-49 hours a week, while 56.9% reported working between 50-69 hours a week. In regard to hours spent with the family, 40.0% reported spending between 1-10 hours a week and 44.6% reported spending between 11-20 hours a week.

Discussion of the Results

The results of this study are organized under the five research questions stated in chapter 1. Under each research question, the relevant null hypotheses are stated and then the results are summarized and discussed.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1. Which of the 12 variables (Age, Spirituality, Years Married, Number of Children, Hours on the Job, Hours With the Family, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Members, Number of Moves, and Counseling) are related to burnout scores among SDA pastors?

Research Question 1 was answered by looking at Null Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. Null Hypothesis 1 stated that there is no significant correlation between scores on the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables. Null Hypothesis 2 stated that there is no significant correlation between scores on the Depersonalization (Dp) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables. Null Hypothesis 3 stated that there is no significant correlation between scores on the reduced
Personal Accomplishment (PA) subscale and scores on any of the 12 independent variables. These null hypotheses were tested by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient.

In relation to Null Hypothesis 1, only 3 of the 12 variables yielded a significant correlation with high Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores. These 3 variables were spirituality, hours with the family, and number of members. The other 9 variables (Age, Years Married, Number of Children, Hours on the Job, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Moves, and Counseling) yielded no significant correlation with Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

First, this finding suggests that pastors who rated themselves as more spiritual tend to exhibit greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE). This may be linked to the greater amount of emotional energy required to constantly present oneself as highly spiritual, ever vigilant, and a somewhat perfect self-representation. However, further research is needed to explore these results (Fisher et al., 2000; Golden, 2002; Plante et al., 2001; Worthington et al., 2003).

Second, the pastor who spends less time with the family tends to have greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores. This finding suggests that the pastor who spends less hours with the family, where one may have time to relax and get support that would help prevent burnout, will have a higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE) score. We find in the literature that the time demands of the pastor’s role, along with time conflicts for clergy in relation to their spouse’s and children’s schedules, make it difficult to establish clear family boundaries which would aid in promoting more time for family. The lack of
these boundaries may account for the pastor spending fewer hours with his family.

Orthner (as cited in Blanton, 1992) supported this finding when he observed that clergy averaged being away from home 12 evenings a month. Norrell (1989) pointed out that clergy were "on call" 7 days a week. The weekend, which for most families is an assumed time for leisure, appeared to be a time when the ministers' job demands intensified. Some spouses and children found it difficult to complain about this lack of time together when the minister was doing "God's work" (Gilbert, 1987). Clergy and their families often felt that it would be inappropriate and "un-Christian" to establish times for family and couple togetherness that were just as "sacred" as church time. Also, a significant problem among clergy couples was a lack of time spent with each other (London & Wiseman, 1993). These above-mentioned authors seem to support the findings on Null Hypothesis 1.

Third, it was also found that the lower the number of members, then the greater the Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores. Although this finding may appear to run counter to the popular thought of what occurs in a smaller congregation, less responsibility and thus less work, in a smaller congregation the pastor is often more involved in his parishioners' lives. The pastor is more likely to be the sole provider of care for his congregation, and thus has to fulfill multiple roles (Sewell & Sewell, 1997/1998; Woodburn, 1997/1998; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). This may account for the higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores.

In relation to Null Hypothesis 2, only 2 of the 12 variables yielded a significant correlation with high Depersonalization (Dp) scores. These 2 variables were years married
and number of members. The other 10 variables (Age, Spirituality, Number of Children, Hours on the Job, Hours With the Family, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Moves, and Counseling) yielded no significant correlation with Depersonalization (Dp).

This hypothesis was tested by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. This finding suggested that the longer the pastor is married, then the higher the Depersonalization (Dp) score. The literature suggested that this depersonalization, elsewhere referred to as cynicism (Maslach & Leiter, 1997), is one of the many ways people detach themselves psychologically from meaningful involvement with others. Such a detachment puts emotional distance between oneself and others whose needs and demands appear overwhelming. Although one would hope that more years married represents a better marriage, and thus makes one better equipped to handle stress, this study found that the more years one had been married, then the greater the Depersonalization (Dp) score was, which is one of the indicators of burnout.

This finding raises several questions such as: Why do more years of marriage seem to contribute to feelings of burnout? Is the Depersonalization (Dp) that occurs related to the stress placed upon the minister and his/her spouse because of the lack of time together, or to the constant pressure to share one’s self and time with a congregation? and What must take place so that one’s marriage and length of time married contributes positively to the lives of pastors? More studies are needed to produce meaningful answers to these questions.

This finding suggested that the fewer the members, then the higher the
Depersonalization (Dp) score. This finding may appear to run counter to the popular belief that a smaller congregation would afford less pressure and stress for the pastor, and afford more time to be with family. This study suggests otherwise. Could it be that because of the smaller number of members, the pastor has fewer resources to call upon and thus ends up having to provide more services to the congregation? One is required to wear multiple hats, so to speak. It may be that the results are suggesting that the fewer the number of members, then the greater the chance of the pastor to feel more overwhelmed. This could lead one to care less and develop negative attitudes towards one’s work. This may account for the experiencing of Depersonalization (Dp), in order to preserve one’s emotional sanity. Beck (1998) supports the findings of this study suggesting that Depersonalization (Dp) was shown to be associated with multiple work roles similar to the situation that pastors of smaller congregations face.

In relation to Null Hypothesis 3, only 3 of the 12 variables yielded a significant correlation with reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). These 3 variables were spirituality, number of children, and hours on the job. The other 9 variables (Age, Years Married, Hours With the Family, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Members, Number of Moves, and Counseling) yielded no significant correlation with Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

This hypothesis was tested by Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. This finding suggests that the minister who rated himself/herself as having greater spirituality is more likely to have greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. This appears to contradict the popular belief on this matter. One would expect that greater
spirituality would result in feelings of greater Personal Accomplishment. But the study found the opposite. The questions that this result raises could be the basis for further research such as: Why do those who rate themselves as being more spiritual seem to feel less Personal Accomplishment (PA)? Is there some aspect of ministry that produces these feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment when one is highly spiritual? and, Could this result be attributed to the fact that greater spirituality is evidence of greater faith and the feeling that all things are possible, not by human power or effort but by Divine intervention, thus the feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA), because whatever is accomplished is done so by God? More research is needed to address these questions.

This study also found that the pastor who has fewer or no children had greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. This result was unexpected and unusual. One would equate fewer children with less stress and more time for Personal Accomplishment. What are the reasons why pastors with fewer children have greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment? When the variable of the number of children a pastor has was individually correlated with the three burnout scales, it was significant only when correlated with the burnout scale of Personal Accomplishment (PA) (Null Hypotheses 1-3). This study suggests that pastors with fewer children tend to experience greater feelings of burnout in the area of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). Could it be that a pastor with no or few children feels less prepared to counsel and/or advise members with parenting issues? Do they, in some way, feel that successfully showing one can rear their own children will
cast light on being a successful pastor as well?

Many religious communities support the view that children are considered a blessing from God. Ps 127:3-5 (KJV) says, “Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward. As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate.” Not having a “quiver full” may contribute to the feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). Could it be that the minister who has no children may feel unprepared to counsel and advise members about parenting because of a lack of personal experience? Further studies are needed to explore this.

Another finding of Null Hypothesis 3 suggests that the pastor who spends more hours on the job tends to have greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). This finding raises several questions that are very important to the clergy: Do ministers who spend more time in ministering to their congregations experience greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment? Is this result related to the question of job satisfaction or inadequate remuneration? Could this result be related to the fact that churches are difficult to handle and that more time in a stressful environment tends to wear one down? Do pastors have the feeling that their work is never finished and so, in an effort to gain some form of accomplishment, they work longer hours and, in turn, experience greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment? This last point has been supported by several authors (Ramey, 2000; Seymour, 1995), and further research is needed to explore all these questions.
With the analysis done by the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, which is now represented by the correlation matrix, we are examining the relationship between the 12 independent variables and Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (Dp), and reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) scores. Information from the correlation matrix, when analyzed, suggested the following: Those who obtained higher scores in Emotional Exhaustion also reported to a significant degree greater spirituality. Those ministers with less time with the family obtained higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores. Ministers who reported fewer number of church members also scored higher on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale.

The study found that ministers reporting greater number of years married were positively related to Depersonalization. It also found that the lower the number of members, the greater the Depersonalization scores. Ministers with greater spirituality were more likely to exhibit greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). Those ministers who reported having fewer children also showed greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). The study also found that ministers who reported more hours on the job tended to have greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment.

Research Question 2

*Research Question 2. Are there any clusters of variables that make one more prone to burnout?*

Research Question 2 was answered by looking at Null Hypotheses 4, 5, and 6.
Null Hypothesis 4 stated that there is no significant difference between mean scores on the EE subscale of subjects with different levels of education. Null Hypothesis 5 stated that there is no significant difference between mean scores on the Dp subscale of subjects with different levels of education. Null Hypothesis 6 stated that there is no significant difference between mean scores on the PA subscale of subjects with different levels of education. These null hypotheses were tested by One-Way ANOVA.

The results of this study answered yes to Research Question 2. Null Hypothesis 4 is retained. There is no significant difference between Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores of subjects with different levels of education. Null Hypothesis 5 is retained. There is no significant difference between Depersonalization (Dp) scores of subjects with different levels of education. Null Hypothesis 6 is rejected. Because of the very different group sizes of frequencies, a post hoc Scheffé test was used to compare the group means. This analysis indicated that pastors with doctorates had significantly higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) than those with Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees.

This finding raises some very interesting questions. Could it be that these respondents with Doctoral degrees feel overprepared for their positions? Could it be that they are disappointed with the menial tasks they are required to do when they clearly feel that they could do more?

Maslach and Jackson (1985) suggest that pastors with Doctorates may feel that more is expected of them. Further analysis suggests that pastors with Doctorates may feel that more is expected of them, because of their greater accomplishments. They may set higher standards for themselves and likely be less forgiving of themselves when they
begin to act like individuals who they consider to be less qualified than themselves.

Further research is needed on this finding.

Research Question 3

Research Question 3. Are SDA pastors significantly experiencing burnout?

Research Question 3 was answered by looking at Null Hypotheses 7, 8, and 9.

Null Hypothesis 7 stated that there is no significant multiple correlation between Emotional Exhaustion (EE) and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables (Age, Spirituality, Years Married, Number of Children, Hours on the Job, Hours With the Family, Time in Present Employment, Time Employed, Number of Congregations, Number of Members, Number of Moves, and Counseling). Null Hypothesis 8 stated that there is no significant multiple correlation between Dp and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables. Null Hypothesis 9 stated that there is no significant multiple correlation between PA and any linear combination of the 12 independent variables. These null hypotheses were tested by stepwise regression analysis.

The results of this study answered yes to Research Question 3. Null Hypothesis 7 was tested by stepwise regression analysis. Five steps were taken by the program. The combination of 5 variables (Age, Spirituality, Hours with the Family, Number of Members, and Number of Moves) yielded a multiple correlation of .5176. This gives $R^2 = .2679$, which indicates that .2679 of the variance of Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores is related to the linear combination of the above-mentioned
5 variables. The null hypothesis was rejected.

This finding suggests that older ministers who reported greater spirituality, less
time spent with family, churches with fewer members, and those with fewer moves were
variables that combined to contribute significantly to greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE).
The reasons why this combination so negatively impacts the lives of pastors needs further
study. Stanton-Rich and Iso-Ahola (1998) also found that this combination of variables
contributed to greater Emotional Exhaustion which might help explain more about this
finding. However, more specific investigation into these areas is needed.

Null Hypothesis 8 was tested by stepwise regression analysis. Only one step was
taken by the program and thus suggested that the fewer the number of members, the
greater the Depersonalization (Dp) score. The variable yielded a multiple correlation
of .2025 ($R^2 = .0410$). No further variables were added. The Null Hypothesis was thus
rejected and supports a study by Beck (1998), which suggested that the smaller the
congregation, the greater the Depersonalization.

Null Hypothesis 9 was tested by stepwise regression analysis. Four steps were
taken by the program. The combination of 4 variables (Age, Spirituality, Number of
Children, and Hours on the Job) yielded a multiple correlation of 0.5113 ($R^2 = .2614$). This
analysis indicated that higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment tend to be
related to a combination of variables, which include being younger, who reported having
lower spirituality, fewer children, and spending more hours on the job. This finding is
supported by Kirsch (2001). Could it be possible that younger ministers may
feel that they have a name to make, or that they are at the beginning of their career with
high ideal, enormous optimism, idealism about his/her ability to be helpful, and a commitment to help people? Could it be that the younger minister works longer hours and justifies the expenditure of time because he is not encumbered by children? Grosch and Olsen (2000) suggest that many of these ministers feel that their spiritual well is completely dry and suffer from disillusionment and a loss of their initial optimism and enthusiasm.

**Research Question 4**

*Research Question 4.* Is there a significant relationship between the three burnout scales and the 12 independent variables used in this study?

Research Question 4 was answered by looking at Null Hypothesis 10. Null Hypothesis 10 stated that there is no significant canonical correlation between a linear combination of the three burnout subscales. This null hypothesis was tested by canonical analysis.

The results of this study answered yes to Research Question 4. The canonical analysis yielded two significant canonical functions. The first function yielded a canonical condition of .6030, including those variables whose weights were at least 50% of the greatest weight in that set, which indicated that the minister who rated himself/herself with greater spirituality, fewer hours with the family, fewer members, and more children tends to have higher Emotional Exhaustion scores and higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected.

The analysis suggests that the pastor who rated himself/herself as having highly
spirituality, spends less time with the family, ministers to a smaller congregation, and has more children was more Emotionally Exhausted and had greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. Several questions are raised by this finding. Could this result suggest that pastors who sees themselves as highly spiritual may become over-committed seeing themselves as invincible because they are working for the Lord? Would this explain the reluctance of the pastor to say no to the needs of his/her congregation and lead to Emotional Exhaustion (EE)? Woodburn (December 1997/January 1998) in his research raised similar questions.

Could this attitude account for a pastor spending less time with his/her family? In research conducted by Maslach and Jackson (1985), they suggest that the family is actually an emotional resource, rather than an emotional drain. They feel that the love and comfort provided by family can help the individual cope more effectively with job stress. When time with the family is reduced, there may be an increase in Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Another question for further research is whether having fewer members may suggest that the pastor must function in multiple roles and interact with the same individuals over and over again and whether this could lead to fatigue, boredom, and Emotional Exhaustion (EE)? Sanford (1982), Oswald (1991), and Daniel and Rogers (1982) suggested that pastors ministering to smaller congregations are more susceptible to burnout. This study found that the pastor who had fewer members was more likely to have greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE) and greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA).
This finding also suggested that the pastor with more children also had greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE) and greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA). This finding is contrary to the current research where Maslach and Jackson (1985) suggest that there is no evidence to support the argument that increased family responsibilities would be correlated with greater burnout. In fact, they suggest that the results showed the opposite effect: Persons with children scored lower on all three aspects of burnout than persons who were childless. Could this finding be attributed to the fact that as variables are added or subtracted from the canonical correlation, they tend to change the outcome? More study is needed to clarify this result.

The second function yielded a canonical condition of 0.4941 which indicated that the minister with fewer children, fewer hours with the family, employed less time, more hours on job, and fewer moves tends to have higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) and higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE) scores. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected. This result appears to suggest that the minister who has fewer children, or no children, and spends less time with the family, who has been employed less time, spends more time per week on the job, and has had fewer moves will have higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment and higher Emotional Exhaustion.

One interpretation of these findings could be that pastors with fewer or no children may find personal fulfillment in the job and become more at risk for burnout. This view is supported by Maslach and Jackson (1985). Perhaps because the pastor has fewer or no children he may spend less time with the family, choosing rather to spend more time per week ministering to his/her congregation. Having been on the job a shorter period of time
pastors may feel they have to put in more hours to meet expectations and please their superiors. Being a newer minister he/she may probably have to stay in a district longer and thus have fewer moves. The combination of these factors may result in higher Emotional Exhaustion and greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. Future research may be needed to further explore these findings.

Research Question 5

Research Question 5. Is the relationship between the 12 independent variables different for the three burnout scales?

Research Question 5 was answered by looking at Null Hypotheses 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16. Null Hypothesis 11 stated that there is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Emotional Exhaustion group, the Average/Medium Emotional Exhaustion group, and the Low Emotional Exhaustion group. Null Hypothesis 12 stated that there is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables of those scoring within the High Depersonalization group, the Average/Medium Depersonalization group, and the Low Depersonalization group. Null Hypothesis 13 stated that there is no significant difference among the mean scores on the 12 demographic variables and those placing within the High Personal Accomplishment group, the Average/Medium Personal Accomplishment group, and the Low Personal Accomplishment group. Null Hypothesis 14 stated that there is no linear combination of the 12 variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings of Emotional Exhaustion. Null Hypothesis 15
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stated that there is no linear combination of the 12 variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings of Depersonalization. Null Hypothesis 16 stated that there is no linear combination of the 12 variables that significantly discriminates among the three groupings of Reduced Personal Accomplishment. These null hypotheses were tested by Analysis of Variance and discriminant analysis.

Null Hypothesis 11

The results of this study answered yes to Research Question 5. Null Hypothesis 11 was studied by Analysis of Variance. The results of the Analysis of Variance showed that significant differences were found between the groups for 4 of the 12 variables when these three groups (Group 1—Low burnout test scores; Group 2—Average/Medium burnout test scores; and Group 3—High burnout test scores) are compared. The results are as follows:

**Spirituality**

Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly higher self-rated spirituality scores than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores). In other words, the high Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group showed significantly higher self-rated spirituality scores than did the low Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group. The finding suggests, once again, that those who reported higher spirituality was linked to greater Emotional Exhaustion (EE). Future research is needed to adequately explain this finding.
Hours With the Family

Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) was significantly higher than Group 3 (High burnout test scores), and Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores) was significantly higher than Group 3 (High burnout test scores). Another way of expressing this finding is that the lower Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group showed significantly more hours with the family than the high Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group. Also, the moderate Emotional Exhaustion group showed significantly more hours with the family than the high Emotional Exhaustion group. Expressed conversely, it was again found that fewer hours with the family was significantly related to higher Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Time in Present Employment

Group 3 (High burnout test scores) was significantly higher than Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores). The high Emotional Exhaustion group had significantly more time at their present employment than the moderate Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group. This may suggest that the more time in one church or district, the greater the Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Number of Members

Group 3 (High burnout test scores) was significantly lower than Groups 1 (Low burnout test scores) or 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores). The high Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group had significantly fewer numbers of members than the low Emotional Exhaustion group or the moderate Emotional Exhaustion group. This may
suggest that the fewer number of members, the greater the Emotional Exhaustion (EE).

Null Hypothesis 12

Null Hypothesis 12 was tested by Analysis of Variance. The results of the Analysis of Variance showed that significant differences were found between the groups for 3 of the 12 variables. The results are as follows:

**Hours With the Family**

Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) was significantly higher than Group 3 (High burnout test scores). Another way to express this significant finding is that the Lower Depersonalization group reported spending more hours with their family than the high Depersonalization group. Expressed conversely, those in this study who spent fewer hours with their family also reported higher burnout scores due to feelings of Depersonalization (Dp).

**Number of Congregations**

Group 3 (High burnout test scores) was significantly lower than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) or Group 2 (Average/Medium burnout test scores). The high Depersonalization group had significantly fewer congregations than the low Depersonalization group or the moderate Depersonalization group. This may suggest that the more congregations that a pastor serves, the higher the Depersonalization (Dp) score.

**Number of Members**

Group 1 (Low burnout test scores) was significantly higher than Group 3 (High...
burnout test scores). The low Depersonalization group had significantly higher numbers of members than the high Depersonalization group. This may suggest that the fewer number of members, the greater the Depersonalization (Dp).

Null Hypothesis 13

Null Hypothesis 13 was tested by Analysis of Variance. The results of the Analysis of Variance showed that significant differences among the groups were present for 2 of the 12 variables. The results are as follows:

**Spirituality**

Group 3 (High burnout test scores) showed significantly higher self-rated spirituality scores than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores). Those pastors with high scores for reduced Personal Accomplishment had significantly higher self-rated spirituality scores than those pastors in the low feelings of the reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) group. This finding is supported by the finding in Hypothesis 11.

**Number of Children**

Group 3 (High burnout test scores) was significantly lower than Group 1 (Low burnout test scores). The high feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment group were significantly higher in respondents who had more children than those in the low feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment (PA) group. This finding was supported by the finding in Hypothesis 10.
Null Hypothesis 14

Null Hypothesis 14 was tested by discriminant analysis. There was one significant function, and the findings indicated that a randomly selected minister who had more hours with the family, who rated himself/herself with lower spirituality, and more members was more likely to have scored in the Low Emotional Exhaustion group. In other words, expressed in the opposite direction, a randomly selected minister who spent fewer hours with the family, who rated himself/herself as having higher spirituality scores, and who had fewer members was more likely to be placed in the High Emotional Exhaustion (EE) group.

Null Hypothesis 15

Null Hypothesis 15 was tested by discriminant analysis. There was one significant function, and the findings indicated that a randomly selected minister who had fewer congregations, fewer members, and spent less hours with the family was more likely to be placed in the High Depersonalization (Dp) group.

Null Hypothesis 16

Null Hypothesis 16 was tested by discriminant analysis. There was one significant function, and the findings indicated that a randomly selected minister with two or more children and who reported himself/herself as having greater spirituality was more likely to be placed in the Low Personal Accomplishment (PA) group.
Conclusions

In the last several years, there have been an increasing number of studies on the phenomenon called burnout. However, very few studies have been done on Seventh-day Adventist ministers and burnout. This study sought to examine various factors and their relationship to burnout among this group of clergy. The study found that 10 of the 12 variables chosen to be examined had a significant relationship to burnout experienced by SDA clergy.

The study found that 10 of the 12 variables chosen to be examined had a positive correlation to the level of burnout experienced by SDA clergy. Those who endorsed high spirituality on the demographic scale were found to be more likely to also receive high Emotional Exhaustion and greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment scores. This finding was consistent throughout the study and throughout the various statistical procedures used to examine the results. This suggests that ministers who rated themselves as highly spiritual were also most likely to experience high scores of Emotional Exhaustion and greater feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. This finding was very interesting due to the expectation that high spirituality would be a desirable trait to be found in our clergy and not one that would be related to two of the subscales of burnout. Plante et al. (2001) found in their study that religious faith is positively correlated with coping well with stress.

The study found that ministers who spent fewer hours with their families were more likely to receive higher scores on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale than those who spent more time with their families. Again, this finding was consistent throughout the
study and throughout the various statistical procedures used to examine the results. This finding agreed with Maslach and Jackson's (1985) findings that stated that the family is actually an emotional resource rather than an emotional drain. The love, aid, and comfort provided by the family can often help the minister more effectively deal with job stress.

Another interesting finding was that the ministers who had fewer church members were more likely to receive higher scores on the Emotional Exhaustion subscale than those with more members. This finding also suggests that the smaller the congregation, the greater the Depersonalization score. This finding appears to be the opposite to what one would expect; however, the answer to this may rest in the fact that a minister in this situation must fulfill multiple roles for the congregation. Beck (1998) supports this approach, stating that more staff and a larger size of church seem to be associated with positive benefits for the minister.

The number of years that a minister has been married was found to be correlated to the Depersonalization score that was experienced. Greater number of years was positively correlated to greater Depersonalization.

The study found that the number of children a minister had was related to the level of burnout that was experienced. Pastors with none to one child scored low on Personal Accomplishment which meant the fewer children, the greater the feeling of reduced Personal Accomplishment. This finding was supported by Maslach and Jackson (1985) who reported no evidence to support the argument that increased family responsibilities would be correlated with greater burnout. Rather, they feel that persons with children scored lower on all three aspects of burnout than did persons who were childless.
This study found that when different combinations of variables were used, the results were different, which suggests that the combination of variables affects the outcome of the study. Further analysis is needed to confirm this finding.

The hours that the minister spent on the job was found to be correlated to feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. The greater the number of hours, the more feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. Also, the years spent with the present church was found to be significantly related to Emotional Exhaustion, a finding supported by the literature (Stanton-Rich & Iso-Ahala, 1998).

In relationship to advanced educational training, the study found that ministers who obtained Doctoral degrees were more likely to have greater scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale than those with Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. This finding was also consistent with the literature (Maslach & Jackson, 1985).

This analysis indicated that the minister who rated himself/herself as having greater spirituality, spends less hours with the family, has fewer members, and has had fewer moves tends to experience greater Emotional Exhaustion. This finding suggests that the combination of certain variables has a significant effect on the Emotional Exhaustion score. This finding was similar to the findings of Stanton-Rich and Iso-Ahola (1998).

This analysis indicated that higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment tend to be related to being younger, having lower spirituality, fewer children, and spending more hours on the job. This finding is supported by Kirsch (2001).

The study found that the minister with higher self-rated spirituality scores, fewer hours with the family, fewer members, and more children tends to have higher Emotional
Exhaustion and lower feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment. The study also found that the minister with fewer children, fewer hours with the family, employed less time, more hours on job, and fewer moves tends to have higher feelings of reduced Personal Accomplishment and higher Emotional Exhaustion.

According to Maslach et al. (1996), a high degree of burnout is reflected in high Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in low scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. An average degree of burnout is reflected in average scores on the three subscales. A low degree of burnout is reflected in low scores on the Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization subscales and in high scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscale. Maslach et al. (1996) state that given the limited knowledge about the relationship between the three aspects of burnout, the scores for each of the subscales are considered separately and are not combined into a single burnout score.

This study examined 130 respondents who were Seventh-day Adventist clergy and found the following for the Emotional Exhaustion subscale: 18 out of 130, or 13.9%, scored in the high degree of burnout range on Emotional Exhaustion; 34 out of 130, or 26.1%, scored in the average or moderate degree of burnout range; and 78 out of 130, or 60%, scored in the low range for burnout. The results for the Depersonalization subscale were as follows: 13 or 10% were in the high degree of the burnout range; 30 respondents or 23.1% were in the average or moderate range for burnout; and 87 or 67% were in the low range for burnout. The results for the Personal Accomplishment subscale, based only on low and high, found that 81 respondents or 62% scored in the low range for burnout and 49 or 38% scored in the high degree of burnout range.
These above-mentioned findings suggest that there may be need for further study to address the number of Adventist clergy who seem to be reporting some degree of burnout.

**Implications**

The following implications for practice are suggested:

Psychologists would be able to better understand the working environment in which a pastor operates and therefore be better able to organize and produce programs or interventions to address the unique needs of the clergy. Psychologists could also give invaluable services, as consultants, to pastors and conference administrators in teaching them how to identify stressors, monitor stress levels, learn and implement stress-reduction techniques, identify symptoms of burnout, and learn and implement ways to decrease burnout. These consultant services would help the pastors and administrators to increase productivity levels and keep the pastors healthier and longer in their churches. Also, these consultant services would eventually spread out and help the church members. Psychologists could be invited to sit on personnel, placement, and disciplinary committees. Psychologists could also teach courses in stress-reduction techniques in the seminary because knowledge is power, and the young minister could learn how to prevent burnout rather than cure it. It is easier for pastors to prevent burnout than to cure or treat burnout.

The study found that the pastors who spent less time with their families were more likely to score higher on the burnout subscales. The literature also suggests that
the family is an asset to the pastor in preventing burnout. Understanding this should lead to more emphasis on teaching clergy how to make their families a priority—as important as any other aspect of their work. To this end, it may be wise to devote some attention to the pastor’s family and ways to ensure that this relationship does not suffer because of the high demands of the job. Here, an education program for the minister and his/her family would be recommended. Clergy should be encouraged to maintain healthy families with appropriate time and attention so that they can model this behavior to their congregations. The opportunity for families to engage in family therapy would help them to cope with the stresses of being a clergy family and should be made available to families in the program of prevention.

It is more cost effective to focus on prevention rather than just treating the symptoms. In planning moves and pastoral assignments, administration would have a more productive formula, if they were aware of the causes of burnout as identified by this research study and other studies cited above. Programs could be instituted to monitor stress and burnout levels of the clergy without any penalty to the clergy. It is important that the pastors be able to use such programs without any fear of retribution or any effect on their upward mobility.

Recommendations

Recommendations made from this study for future research include the following:

1. Replication of this study using a larger sample or larger N to test the consistency
of findings observed in this research study.

2. Replication of this study with subjects randomly assigned and a more diverse sampling or areas such as geographic location to allow for greater generalization of findings.

3. Further study on the stressors that contribute to burnout with specific emphasis on the Seventh-day Adventist subculture, such as, spirituality, years married, number of hours on the job, age, church size, time with family, number of moves, children, and education.

4. A longitudinal study with a larger sample to further investigate the different issues that may trigger burnout throughout the different life stages.

5. Making the results of the study available to conference administrators so that they can plan and implement programs to prevent burnout in their workforce.

6. Have church members provide their assessment and/or feedback on how they feel their pastor is performing.

7. Have psychologists, who are also pastors, perform more research in the area of burnout in order to potentially obtain more information from the research subjects.
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APPENDIX A

AUTHORIZATION TO PERFORM STUDY
November 21, 2002

Winston D Edwards

4529 East Michigan Avenue
Phoenix
AZ 85032

Dear Winston

RE: APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS
IRB Protocol #: 02-G-084       Application Type: Original       Dept: Education
Review Category: Exempt       Action Taken: Approved       Advisor: Nancy Carbonell
Protocol Title: A Study On Various Factors and Their Relationship to Burnout Among SDA Clergy

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) I want to advise you that your proposal has been reviewed and approved. You have been given clearance to proceed with your research plans.

All changes made to the study design and/or consent form, after initiation of the project, require prior approval from the IRB before such changes can be implemented. Feel free to contact our office if you have any questions.

The duration of the present approval is for one year. If your research is going to take more than one year, you must apply for an extension of your approval in order to be authorized to continue with this project.

Some proposal and research design designs may be of such a nature that participation in the project may involve certain risks to human subjects. If your project is one of this nature and in the implementation of your project an incidence occurs which results in a research-related adverse reaction and/or physical injury, such an occurrence must be reported immediately in writing to the Institutional Review Board. Any project-related physical injury must also be reported immediately to the University physician, Dr. Loren Hamel, by calling (616) 473-2222.

We wish you success as you implement the research project as outlined in the approved protocol.

Sincerely,

Michael D Pearson
Graduate Assistant
Office of Scholarly Research
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APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE
Dear Sir:

As you know, I am a member of the Arizona Conference and I am also a doctoral student at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan. I have completed all of the class-work and the doctoral internship required to obtain a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology, and I am currently working on a dissertation.

Recently my dissertation committee approved my proposal topic. I wanted to research a topic that has some practical value to the ministry, and I believe this one meets that criterion. The effects of burnout on Seventh Day Adventist Pastors. The majority of research has focused on clergy from other denominations. This study will look at variables that are most likely to cause burnout in the Adventist clergy. The results obtained will be beneficial not only to the pastors, but also to their administrators who will have greater insights into how to preserve their workers.

I have limited my study to pastors working in the Pacific Union Conference of which Arizona is a part. My definition of pastor includes those individuals who have a Bachelors, Master's, D.Min or Ph.D. degree in religion, theology or other related fields and are employed as pastors in the field.

I am requesting two things in this letter:

Your written permission to include pastors in your employ to be a part of this study and Your assistance in encouraging our pastors to complete two instruments (The Maslack Burnout Inventory) and a demographic sheet and return them to me.

I will gladly provide you a summary of the results of this study if you should so desire. Results will be reported in group form and will not reflect individual pastors responses, thereby protecting their anonymity.

If you need further information you can reach me by writing or by telephone at 602-485-7985. Thank you for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

W. Don Edwards
Ph.D. Candidate
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, NH 49104

Enclosures: Demographic Sheet and The Maslack Burnout Inventory.
15 November 2002

Pastor W. Don Edwards
4529 E. Michigan Avenue
Phoenix AZ 85032

Dear Don,

Thank you for your letter concerning your research project. This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled ‘Burnout in the Adventist Clergy’ has been approved. You may conduct your survey among the pastors employed in our conference.

I expect that the project will be conducted as described in your request letter, and that you will obtain all the necessary clearances from your academic institution.

I wish you success in the pursuit of your research goal.

Sincerely

Orville Parchment

President
Arizona Conference of Seventh Day Adventist
APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENTATION
Pastoral Services Demographic Data Sheet

Your sex:

_______ (1) male _______ (2) female

Your age:

_______ years

Are you (check only one group)

_______ (1) Asian, Asian American
_______ (2) Black
_______ (3) Latino, Hispanic, Mexican American
_______ (4) Native American, American Indian
_______ (5) White, Caucasian
_______ (6) Other (please specify ___________________________)

How spiritual do you consider yourself to be? (Circle the appropriate number.)

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

very spiritual not at all spiritual

Marital status:

_______ (1) single _______ (2) married _______ (3) divorced
_______ (4) widowed _______ (5) other (please specify ___________________________)

If married, for how long have you been married to your current spouse?

_______ years

If you have children, how many of them are now living with you?

_______ children live with me
_______ I have no children

What was the highest level you completed in school? (Check only one answer.)

_______ (1) completed high school _______ (2) some college _______ (3) completed 4 years of college
_______ (4) some postgraduate work or degree _______ (5) other (please specify ___________________________)
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Please check the highest degree you have received.

(1) A.A. (5) R.N. (9) Th. D. (13) D.Min
(2) B.A. (6) L.P. N. (10) Ed. D. (14) Other
(3) M.A/M.S (7) M.D. (11) J.D.

What is the primary area in which you work? (Check only one answer.)

(1) Chaplin (2) Mental Health (3) Education
(4) Social Services (5) Administration (6) Ordained Pastor
(7) Un-ordained Pastor (8) Counseling (9) Departmental Leader
(10) Literature Evangelist (11) other

What is the level of your primary position? (Check only one answer.)

(1) staff member (4) intern
(2) supervisor I manager (5) Licensed minister
(3) administrator (6) other (please specify)

How many hours per week do you work at the job indicated above?

_________ hours per week

How many hours per week do you spend with family and personal hobbies?

_________ hours per week

How long have you been at your present job?

_________ years

How long have you been employed for this general type of work?

_________ years

How many congregations do you pastor?

_________ members.

How many times have you moved, from one district to another?

_________

Have you ever received counseling?

Yes No

In your opinion, did it help?

Yes No.
DATA FORMAT

Row 1  2 Rows per Subject

Columns

1-3  Subject Number
4    Gender
5-6  Age
7    Ethnicity
8    Spirituality
9    Marital Status
10-11 Years of Marriage
12-13 Number of Children
14   Highest Level of School Completed
15-16 Highest Degree Earned
17-18 Primary Area of Work
19   Primary Position
20-21 Hours on Job per Week
22-23 Hours Spent with Family
24-25 How Long at Present Position
26-27 Length of Employment
28   How Many Congregations
29-32 Number of Members
33-34 Number of Moves
35   Received Counseling
36   Did it Help.

Row 2

Columns

1-22 Responses to Items 1-22  MBI Human Services Survey
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0652201012120131101232130
066161532210141206248120221103710811
066001101322113101234150
06714552222003020627020052210900722
0672313224152061331555151
0681646224230206268120520104210711
068122013240131102134210
06915722180130206269110522102200422
0692223331112223215401000
070139522130231206250200212101670511
0702221003240132102342130
0711515220013036260150420101800511
071223022313231032110100
07213922180241206270250416101250311
0723221342422131023104210
073142522920241206250150618102610611
0731112023120101233130
07416652230242106250160430102000722
074001201310141101233140
0751483219030207555120218301660322
0752122014130131201455120
0761562214013020764005030810940011
0763245242303423223231
07716922360041306248120338100641011
077211401314121111223110
078134432110341207260120105201030311
0782112014040130100444140
07914821201051206350181226000000511
079000500505061100556051
080135522130341206255200113103000611
080215216161064401665151
0811374221402412062601404121000322
0811215115151050000665061
0821511228024030624024013010450102
082000001100010000120110
0831375121500412062602403132050000422
0830003114161161401656051
0841293320402302075801000303201910111
0841223011260040303554154
085149642160241206282121717404600522
08541150151421404161411101
0861595123000408062603003103000322
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