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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to explore the levels of burnout and organizational commitment within teacher-coaches, and additionally, to explore the degree to which organizational commitment mediated the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout. The data was analyzed with quantitative analyses including multiple regression analysis and mediation analysis. Survey data was collected through the use of the Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educators Survey (Maslach, 1986) and the Meyer, Allen, and Smith’s (1993) Revised Three Component Model (TCM) Commitment Survey. In total, 42 teacher-coaches and 21 teachers from Orange County, NY were eligible for the study, and thus, 63 total sets of data were analyzed. Additional background questions were added to the survey items for grouping purposes. The background questions were designed to probe the participants’ gender, subjects taught, sports coached, years of teaching experience, and years with current organization.

The analyses revealed a significant difference between teachers and teacher-coaches in the personal accomplishment subscale of burnout, in the sense that teacher-coaches yielded a significantly greater level of accomplishment. The results also revealed a significantly higher level of affective commitment in teacher-coaches relative to teachers. Furthermore, mediation analysis showed evidence of partial mediation of the relationship between teacher-coaches and personal accomplishment by affective commitment.

Future research should explore the impact of wins and losses on the relationship between a coach and their level accomplishment and commitment. Future research may also explore the degree to which the various sports individually impact this relationship given the varying degree of popularity and following among the individual interscholastic sports. Lastly, future research
should be dedicated to finding the degree to which a teacher’s level of burnout and commitment is influenced by participating in other extracurricular roles within the school that are not sport-based.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Teacher burnout is a global matter. Nearly half of the educators in India, for example, experience burnout (Shukla & Trivedi, 2008), and nearly half of the teaching force in Jordan suffer exhaustion resulting from burnout (Alkhateeb, Kraishan, & Salah, 2015). In the U.K., 91% of teachers experience stress due to excessive workload and subsequent anxiety (Stanley, 2014).

In the United States, nearly half of all new teachers will depart the profession by their fifth year of service, and this is due largely to long hours, insufficient autonomy and large class sizes. These conditions illustrate a clear landscape - that teachers are exposed to a pernicious environment conducive to burnout. The high rate of attrition, coupled with a nationwide decline in enrollment numbers of teacher preparation programs identify the need to confront the teacher burnout problem (Crowell, 2017).

Burnout can be imagined differently based on individual perception, but for the intents and purposes of this project, the term burnout represents a state of mental and emotional exhaustion that prevents a professional from optimally performing their role(s). And so, emphasis should be placed on confronting burnout in the workplace, but added emphasis should be placed on engaging burnout among educators because teacher burnout poses an added concern for two reasons: first, burnout is detrimental to the emotional and holistic health of the teacher experiencing it, such that the teacher is more likely to experience diminished work performance (Jacobsen, 2016). This is also detrimental to the performance of students and the performance of the school since the teacher would not be fulfilling their duty of teaching children to the best of their ability. Therefore, it has been noted burnout not only impacts the
emotional and physical well-being of the teacher but also affects their ability to teach in a positive and effective manner.

In addition to carrying deleterious effects for students and teachers, burnout is considered a key predictor of turnover - and high teacher turnover is regarded as a major setback for student achievement (Ronfeldt, Loeb and Wyckoff, 2013). For those reasons, priority should be placed on taking protective action against teacher burnout. Doing so, however, first requires an accurate and nuanced understanding of the determinants of burnout, so that those determinants can be addressed before burnout manifests itself within an organization. Nevertheless, applying these actions may assist the turnover rate by decreasing the numbers of teachers that leave the position after a period.

Teacher burnout greatly affects students. Teacher burnout is not only a key precursor to teacher turnover (Hughes, 2001; Jayaratne & Chess, 1984; Dworkin, 1985), it stands alone, so to speak, in its unfavorable impact on student outcomes (Ronfeldt, Loeb and Wyckoff, 2013). In other words, a professional experiencing burnout is at higher risk of leaving their job on their own volition but also leaves a vulnerability for burnout to impact their classroom. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the specific theme of teacher-coach burnout. Many studies have already considered the unique challenges, namely role conflict, that confront the teacher-coach (Figone, 1986; Sisley et al., 1987; Rosse-Richards, 2013). Conversely, findings from the situation of the teacher-coach could also be applied to the situation of the teacher. In other words, since burnout is an experience unique to the individual it is likely that teacher-coaches experience burnout differently than teachers. For example, it is plausible to speculate the teacher-coach has advantages with respect to burnout that the teacher does not have - and if this is so, attention could then be dedicated to identifying the sources of those advantages and then attempting to
replicate them for teachers. This is an important prospect to consider given a study by Richards (2013) that implied similarities in burnout rate among teacher-coaches and teachers without exploring potential sources of burnout mitigation a teacher-coach may possess.

Understanding the impact of burnout on an individual can be complicated. To a certain extent, the phenomenon of teacher-coach burnout can be understood as a subset of teacher burnout in general; that is, teacher-coach burnout could be considered a small circle within the much larger circle of teacher burnout. This would mean that the factors that influence teacher burnout, in general, could also influence teacher-coach burnout, even as teacher-coach burnout would have unique, additional determinants that are not shared by all teacher burnout cases—specifically, greater exposure to role conflict. Role conflict is an important construct to examine given it has not only been reported to exist in teacher-coaches but has also been reported to produce an exacerbation of burnout (Figone, 1994; Moss, 2015; Oliveras-Foundez, 2015). That is, the effect of taking on a dual-natured role would not affect teachers in terms of added role conflict since the teacher does not possess a dual-natured role. So, the teacher-coach is conceptualized as a teacher and as a coach, individually, but also as a professional with a dual-natured role to fulfill. This conceptualization of the teacher-coach suggests a high probability for the influence of role conflict given many studies suggesting role conflict affects teachers and teacher-coaches, but also the added likelihood of experiencing it based on the dual-nature of teaching and coaching simultaneously. This project seeks to explore the nature and implications of that dynamic in terms of potential advantages to burnout.

**Statement of the Problem**

At a rudimentary conceptual level, it would seem there is a strong reason to believe the teacher-coach faces a distinct and formidable disadvantage with respect to burnout relative to the
teacher. That disadvantage is rooted primarily in the notion that a teacher-coach, with the dual demands of the role, faces inherently greater exposure to role conflict due to the obligation to fulfill both the teacher role and the coach role simultaneously. This increased exposure to role conflict puts the teacher-coach at an elevated risk of experiencing burnout in view of the fact that role conflict tends to exacerbate burnout in professionals (Figone, 1994; Sage, 1987).

Interestingly, however, Richards (2013) found teacher-coaches to experience burnout at a similar level than teachers. The reason this is so is uncertain as no study has yet dedicated itself to exploring potential sources of burnout mitigation in teacher-coaches. If the increased exposure to role conflict does not yield a higher rate of burnout, finding the precise reason(s) why this is so would be a worthy exploration. There is also insufficient literature devoted to comparing the rates of burnout between teachers and teacher-coaches as the Richards (2013) study noted above is the only such study to do so.

There are many factors that could affect a teacher-coaches alternative level of burnout, and it is reasonable to speculate that one of these factors may involve organizational commitment. The shortfall in burnout-related literature unlatches the probability that the landscape regarding teacher-coaches and burnout is incomplete and that other influential constructs in this relationship have yet to be identified. This study aims to explore whether the teacher-coach possesses a unique buffer to burnout that the teacher does not - and if that buffer is organizational commitment.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout, and furthermore, to investigate the potential mediation in that relationship by organizational commitment. No study has yet explored the construct of organizational
commitment in teacher-coaches nor its impact on teacher-coach burnout. There exists, however, an inaugural study in this area that examines the differences in organizational commitment between male and female teacher-coaches at the high school level (Voloshin, 2016). The results indicate no difference in the levels of organizational commitment of male coaches relative to female coaches but do indicate a variance in commitment levels across all participants of the study. Voloshin (2016) is the first to identify organizational commitment as an existing construct in teacher-coaches, and thus, this relationship is worthy of further investigation.

There also exists literature that examines the mitigating influence of organizational commitment on burnout in various professions other than education. King and Sethi (1997), for example, suggested organizational commitment produces a buffer to burnout in information systems professionals. The results imply higher levels of commitment shield a professional from burnout onset, or at least protects from the more significant effects of it. In light of this research, there is left the possibility that teacher-coaches, despite being at an inherent disadvantage for burnout through greater exposure to role conflict, may actually experience less burnout than teachers because the dual role also yields organizational commitment.

It is worth turning attention to three studies that support the notion of an enhanced sense of organizational commitment in teacher-coaches. Barbuto (2005) discussed the accrued advantages from having intrinsic motivation or feeling genuinely committed to and prideful in one's work, as opposed to extrinsic motivation or having a more mercenary mindset in which the importance lies in meeting requirements and earning monetary compensation. It could be hypothesized that intrinsic motivation is correlated with organizational commitment, since a professional with loyalty to their organization would be more inclined to go above and beyond for it since they would view the success of their organization as their own personal success, to
some degree. This is an important conceptual link to consider, given the possibility that the source of the internal motivation of a coach may originate from wins and losses rather than more external motivations like monetary compensation.

With respect to intrinsic motivation, Foley (2010) conducted an in-depth exploration of the importance of high school football in shaping the identities of Texas communities. In this context, it could further be assumed the teacher-coach, by fulfilling a role in the school's athletic programs, develops an enhanced sense of what is commonly called "school spirit" relative to those who are not involved. School spirit might then catalyze higher levels of intrinsic motivation since the identity of the teacher-coach would, to some extent, merge with the identity of the school. According to this emergent conceptual framework, this would mean that the commitment of a teacher-coach may also be enhanced and that the teacher-coach might then be shielded from the more significant manifestations of burnout. These inquiries are significant, as the results would shed added light on the dimensions of burnout and organizational commitment present within teacher-coaches and teachers as well as the mediating effects on burnout by commitment.

While coaching may yield intrinsic motivation which in turn may yield higher organizational commitment in coaches, it has already been found that coaching yields higher levels of affective commitment, in particular. Turner (2001) studied the organizational and occupational commitment levels of over 700 collegiate-level head coaches. The results indicated the coaches in the sample were highly committed to their organization and remaining in their position primarily through feelings of loyalty to it. This is referred to as affective commitment. Also, of note, this sample of coaches scored lowest in the area of continuance commitment, meaning they were not remaining in their positions due to insufficient employment alternatives.
Essentially, these findings suggest collegiate coaches are committed to their schools through a heightened sense of loyalty, and if collegiate coaches are highly loyal to their schools, it is reasonable to assert a similar sentiment might also exist in high school coaches. This finding is highly significant given no study has compared the organizational commitment of coaches to non-coaches.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Various factors impact the risk of burnout in a given profession. This project will specifically address the problem of burnout as it pertains to the professional role of a teacher-coach. For the intents and purposes of the present project, the following research questions will be explored:

a. To what extent is being a teacher-coach (as opposed to being a non-coaching teacher) associated with burnout and its three dimensions (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment)?

b. To what extent is being a teacher-coach associated with organizational commitment and its three dimensions (normative, affective and continuance commitment)?

c. To what extent does organizational commitment mediate the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout and its three dimensions?

A central hypothesis of the present project is that teacher-coaches experience an elevated sense of organizational commitment relative to teachers and that this elevated organizational commitment serves as a mediator to burnout. Pertinent research explicitly supports this - that commitment has a mitigating effect on burnout (King and Sethi, 1997). The validity of this hypothesis would have significant implications. If valid, then the variable of organizational
commitment may, to some extent, neutralize the effects of the increased exposure to role conflict, and may leave teacher-coaches and teachers at a similar level of burnout - offering support to the findings of the Richards (2013) study.

It is also possible that the impact of organizational commitment would be substantial enough to nullify the negative effects of role conflict, with the net result being that the average teacher-coach would experience less burnout than the average teacher. This is a unique line of inquiry, and one that has yet to be explored, and the hypotheses of this project are built around this unknown. If the hypotheses of the present project prove to be valid, then the emerging implication would be that engaging with an organization in multiple capacities could significantly diminish the effects of burnout through a pathway of enhanced organizational commitment. If this is the case, the implications would be such that all teachers should be encouraged to engage with their schools in multiple capacities, namely as a coach, as a safeguard against burnout.

**Figure 1**

*The Effect of Organizational Commitment*

![Diagram](image)

*Note.* Diminished burnout in teacher-coaches through organizational commitment
Research Design

Given this conceptual possibility, along with a discussion of the literature regarding the constructs of organizational commitment and burnout, this project will attempt to answer its fundamental inquiries in a direct manner. A reliable tool, widely known and well regarded in measuring burnout was identified during the analysis of the existing literature (Schaufeli & Taris, 2005; Loera, Converso, Viotti, 2014). Furthermore, the analysis of the literature has also led to the discovery of a specialized version of this tool, designed specifically for measuring the burnout construct in educators and school professionals. This instrument, the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES), presents an opportunity to gather burnout data among teachers in a straightforward manner. This survey instrument is available online for purchase for the price of $200.

Similarly, reliable and regularly used tools also exist for measuring the construct of organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model, for example, has been widely used in research for the purpose of measuring the professional's psychological attachment to their organization. This three-component model measures organizational commitment in three separate domains: affective commitment, or one's psychological attachment to the organization; continuance commitment, or one's "need" to stay in the organization; and normative commitment, one's inclination to stay with the organization through feelings of obligation.

This project will seek teaching professionals at the elementary, middle and high school levels as participants by obtaining permission to seek participation from their building principal after approval from the District Superintendent. The names and contact information (email addresses) of building principals and school Superintendents from upstate New York (Orange
County) will be obtained via an Internet search of school districts within the county. If and when permissions are granted, the researcher will obtain teacher email addresses via the school's website, and the researcher will email faculty members asking for participation. The e-mail will explain the aim and parameters of the study, and ask specific background questions for grouping purposes. These preliminary questions will include:

a. How many years have you been a teacher?

b. Are you male or female?

c. What subject(s) are you currently teaching?

d. What grade levels are you currently teaching?

e. How many total years have you coached a school sports team?

f. What sport(s) are you currently coaching?

g. How many years have you been employed at your current school district?

This project seeks to include roughly 80 participants, 40 teacher-coaches (50%) and 40 teachers (50%). This should provide adequate power for the study to draw meaningful statistical inferences. The study will seek to actually include about 80 sets of data responses, which means if the originally selected teachers end up not responding to the request for responses, then the researcher may proceed to recruit new participants for the study until about 80 sets of actual responses have been retrieved.

The data for this project will be retrieved by administering the survey tools identified above regarding burnout and organizational commitment to the selected subjects of the study. Once the subjects have been identified, administering the surveys should be a fairly straightforward process that can be done by the researcher alone. Each of the responses will be coded in terms of whether it is coming from a teacher-coach or a teacher, although the data will
also be anonymized such that the identities of the subjects will be protected and no one will possess the ability to identify specific responses from specific persons. The data from the surveys will consist of the sole source of data for the project. Given the tools at hand, the study will utilize a quantitative design.

The present project will utilize multiple regression analysis to produce meaningful findings out of the raw data obtained from the participants in the study. Since regression analysis is a commonly used statistical process for estimating the relationships among variables, it will be used to determine relationships between the status of being a teacher-coach (independent variable or "predictor") and the constructs of organizational commitment and burnout (dependent variables).

More specifically, organizational commitment is conceptualized as a mediator between the independent variable of teacher-coach status and the dependent variable of burnout. This logically follows from the fact the literature is unanimous that organizational commitment is a component construct of burnout. That is, within the concept of burnout itself, organizational commitment is the predictor that produces the dependent variable of burnout. The present study adds another link to this chain by considering teacher-coach status as the original predictor that affects organizational commitment and thus burnout. The main hypothesis here is teacher-coach status will increase levels of organizational commitment and organizational commitment will have a moderating effect on burnout (i.e. the teacher-coach is protected from burnout by virtue of the dual-natured role he fulfills through a pathway of enhanced organizational commitment).

**Significance of the Study**

The conclusions of the present project will have implications for school leaders who are seeking to combat the deleterious effects of teacher burnout and turnover within their schools.
For example, if the direct conclusion can be drawn that organizational commitment has a mediating effect on burnout following teacher-coaches reporting significantly lower levels of burnout than teachers, there then would exist a foundation for the belief that a teacher-coach or a teacher with at least an interest in coaching may be a more desirable candidate than a teacher who has no interest in the coaching role whatsoever. The implication would then follow the coaching role would actually enhance the teacher's sense of organizational commitment and thus protect against the negative effects of stress and burnout. Likewise, if higher organizational commitment is found to exist in teacher-coaches, it could also imply that encouraging teachers to engage in more roles could holistically benefit them as a professional, and in turn, benefit their students - since the added roles could be regarded as a buffer to burnout onset. Furthermore, if teacher-coaches possess enhanced organizational commitment relative to teachers, future studies could then be dedicated to exploring the differences in organizational commitment among various coaches, and if coaching success is associated with organizational commitment. In other words, future research could identify what sport(s) yield higher degrees of organizational commitment and to what extent winning plays a role in influencing that relationship.

On the contrary, however, if the findings of the study indicate teacher-coaches are not subject to increased organizational commitment, the implication would be that engaging in school in more than one capacity may not be a desirable situation, and perhaps focusing solely on the teaching role would be a better option for educators. This is an important implication to consider, as school leaders could then shift their focus to identify other methods of battling burnout within their schools. Such a result would leave open the possibility that the relationship between burnout and being a teacher-coach is influenced not by organizational commitment, but by an alternate construct that future studies could more fully explore.
The results of this study will be a significant contribution to the field (i.e. the literature on burnout), because in general, the literature thus far has seemingly only focused on the negative aspects of being a teacher-coach. That is, it is clear the teacher-coach is a professional who must juggle two fairly distinct professional roles simultaneously, and this implies a significant risk of added exposure to role stress and eventual burnout. This insight, taken in and of itself, would seem to suggest a teacher-coach would experience greater amounts of burnout than a teacher, which in turn would suggest a teacher may not strive to become a teacher-coach unless specifically asked to do so.

The present project, however, opens the possibility of a positive aspect of being a teacher-coach. This view does not dismiss the basic fact that the teacher-coach will likely be at greater risk of experiencing greater role conflict and role stress due to occupying two roles. The idea here is although being a teacher-coach will indeed carry this negative effect, it may also carry the positive effect of heightened organizational commitment, perhaps to the point that the positive effects of organizational commitment prove to be stronger than and outweigh the negative effects of stress as experienced by the teacher-coach. If this were the case, then the conclusion that would follow is that despite the inherent risks of a teacher-coach, those risks would be worth it, so to speak, because the potential advantages could outweigh the potential risks. If this proves to be the case, then the conclusion to follow might be that teachers should be encouraged to fill more than one role within their schools and that doing so would be an effective strategy for developing protection against burnout.

This is a reversal of perspective that the extant literature on burnout does not seem to have rigorously considered in any professional context, let alone the specific context of teachers and teacher-coaches. Thus far, the literature on burnout has clearly delineated the effects of the
different constructs on burnout - however, studies have not yet appeared to consider why teacher-coaches and teachers seem to have a similar burnout experience. Almost all the extant literature explores the negative aspects of a teacher-coach that contribute to burnout, while some literature explores the determinants of organizational commitment and its effects on professional burnout; but no literature seems to consider whether heightened organizational commitment exists in teacher-coaches and if its impact on burnout is the counterpoint to the additional stress and role conflict a teacher-coach is exposed to.

**Limitations/Delimitations**

As is typically the case with survey data, the possibility exists the survey data collected may be unreliable for any of the following reasons:

1. Respondents may not feel comfortable providing answers that present them in an unfavorable manner.
2. Respondents may not provide accurate answers from insufficient memory regarding the object of inquiry.
3. Respondents may, in general, provide answers they think sound "correct" as opposed to answers that are actually true.

For the reasons listed above, it would behoove the researcher to notify participants that the survey results will be kept anonymous as respondents may feel more comfortable providing truthful and accurate answers if they are assured those answers will be kept confidential.

Additionally, it is expected the MBI-ES instrument will not thoroughly indicate teacher-coaches experience greater or lesser degrees of burnout than teachers, due to the fact that many other potential factors influence these constructs. In other words, the study will not definitively conclude that coaching in addition to teaching causes or prevents any of the measured constructs,
due to the simple fact that correlation is not causation, and the rigor of a survey study is not adequate for demonstrating clear causal relationships. However, once the study is complete, one can move into a more specific investigation as to what it is about being a teacher-coach that might cause or prevent these constructs. In short, the present project could be foundational for an entire line of inquiry into the phenomenon of teacher burnout.

For example, a future study on the subject could pursue a qualitative methodology and ask teacher-coaches how they perceive their own experiences of fulfilling a dual-natured job. The feedback from the teacher-coaches could then be matched against the findings of the present study to determine whether the perceptions of the teacher-coaches are compatible with the findings produced by this study. With greater time and resources, it may also be possible to conduct a cross-sectional study that examines burnout levels of teacher-coaches relative to teachers to determine whether there is a pattern that holds at the macro-level. If there is, then this could provide further support to the findings of the present study.

Ultimately, it may not be possible to conduct an actual randomized controlled trial, since this would require actually assigning teachers to coaching roles for the purposes of the study, which would almost certainly be unfeasible and require an impossible level of intrusion into the functioning of a school. It may thus not be possible to develop a study that could actually demonstrate causal relationships, given the limits imposed by the questions being asked. Nevertheless, by conducting studies that utilize different scales and methodologies, it may be possible to triangulate a conclusion that comes close to a workable best practice consensus, even if it may remain impossible for logistical reasons to demonstrate actual causality in the strict sense.
Furthermore, the Richards (2013) study alludes to the possibility that often times the teacher-coach may engage in what is called role retreatism of the teaching role, a notion proposed by Milslagle and Morley (2004) which essentially implies a teacher-coach, due to viewing themselves primarily as either a teacher or a coach, withdraw emotionally from the duties of one role or the other as a subconscious defense against the effects of role conflict. This, admittedly, is a possible explanation why teacher-coaches might experience burnout at a similar rate to teachers, and one that should be more thoroughly explored, but the results of the study indicate a majority of teacher-coaches (roughly 60%) surveyed, did not engage in role retreatism - leaving the door open to the possibility that there is another, unknown construct at play.

Furthermore, assuming role retreatism exists at a significant level, it should undeniably be isolated and comprehensively explored as it would trigger an immense concern for school leaders, as it essentially suggests an emotional withdrawal from the duties and responsibilities associated with teaching or coaching. This study does not aim to further explore the construct of role retreatism in teacher-coaches, but will, depending on the results of the study, consider further exploration into such a viable consideration for a future study.

**Definition of Terms**

Burnout - a psychological syndrome involving emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment that occurs among various professionals who work with other people in challenging situations (Maslach, 1982).

Role Conflict (RC) - When expectations are perceived as incompatible for multiple roles or positions in society (Decker 1986; Millslagle & Morley, 2004).

Teacher-Coach (TC) - A teacher that also performs coaching duties on an interscholastic athletic team.
Teacher - A teacher that performs solely the role of the teacher within their school district, and not an additional role as a coach of interscholastic athletics.

Organizational Commitment (OC) – an employee’s psychological state that attaches him or her to an organization, resulting in a reduced turnover (Allen & Meyer, 1990).

Affective Commitment (AC) – “the employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization. Employees with a strong affective commitment continue employment in the organization because they want to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 11).

Continuance Commitment (CC) – an employee’s “awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization. Employees who have strong continuance commitment to an organization stay with the organization because they believe they have to do so” (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 56).

Continuance Commitment High Sacrifice (CC: HiSac) – the high sacrifice of personal investments in an organization if an individual were to leave that organization (Turner, 2008). These individuals “remain with the organization because they believe they would lose a lot personally by leaving the organization” (Turner, 2008, p. 17).

Continuance Commitment Low Alternative (CC: LoAlt) – an employee who is staying committed to an organization with the perceived alternatives available to him or her (Turner, 2008).

Normative Commitment (NC) – an employee who has a feeling of obligation to continue employment. Employees with a high level of normative commitment feel they ought to remain with the organization because it is the “right and moral” thing to do (Meyer & Allen, 1997, p. 60).
Conclusion

In summary, the present chapter consisted of an introduction to the project. It has been shown here that the question under consideration regarding teacher-coaches and burnout is a significant one, and it has also been shown the study will utilize a novel analytical framework and conceptual model to produce insights into the phenomenon of burnout that have not yet been considered by the extant literature on this subject. The conclusion will be determined following whether teacher-coaches experience burnout at a different level than teachers based on organizational commitment and the possible inquiries of this particular career.

A thorough review of the relevant literature will provide a general context that summarizes what is known about the phenomenon of burnout, and thus will provide the proper context for examining the specific connections between organizational commitment and teacher-coach burnout. For example, the literature review will provide the foundations for a fundamental conceptual model regarding how the different individual constructs affect the outcome of burnout. It will become clear the hypotheses of the present study have been strongly grounded in the implications derived from the relevant literature on each of the constructs.

The literature review will serve as a point of departure for the unique questions that are being considered by the present project. The review will proceed from the broad to the narrow. For example, the review will begin with a consideration of the general concept of burnout, including its specific determinants as they have been identified and conceptualized in the relevant literature. It will then proceed to a more specific consideration of burnout among teachers; and finally, will turn to a consideration of burnout among teacher-coaches in particular, in light of the key component constructs of burnout as well as what is known about burnout among teachers in general. By the end of the literature review, it should become clear the
Specific inquiries of this project have not yet been addressed by the extant literature on the subject of burnout.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

As outlined in the introduction of this work, the purpose of this project is to fully traverse the constructs of organizational commitment and burnout in teacher-coaches and to inspect potential mediation by organizational commitment on the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout. There exists a limited volume of literature germane to this specific exploration in teacher-coaches; therefore, this review will consider a variety of themes related to this line of inquiry. These themes will include a general description of burnout and an analysis of its determinants, on the grounds that the determinants affecting teachers, in general, would also affect teacher-coaches in particular. In addition, this study will analyze organizational commitment and its influence on the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout.

Burnout

History

Burnout was first introduced into literature by Freudenberger in the 1970s (Freudenberger, 1974). At the time, burnout was defined as a state of mental fatigue or frustration that results from professional relationships that fail to produce expected rewards and outcomes (Freudenberger, 1974). Maslach (1982) later defined burnout in more specific terms, as a syndrome involving emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment that occurred among professionals who work with other people in challenging situations. Maslach concluded burnout to weaken the care and attention given to clients of human service professionals such as teachers, police officers, lawyers, nurses, and others (Poghosyan, 2009).

There is a lack of consensus regarding the quantification of burnout. The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) is the most routinely used instrument for measuring burnout.
(Poghosyan, 2009). The MBI tool encapsulates three dimensions of burnout: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. These subscales were demonstrated by Maslach (1981) to possess good psychometric properties. Other research has added evidence further confirming the validity of the MBI instrument in measuring burnout (Greenglass, Burke, & Fiksenbaum, 2001; Hastings, Horne, & Mitchell, 2004; Evans-Turner, Veitch, & Higgins, 2010), and also supporting the validity of the three burnout subscales (Evans & Fischer, 1993). However, some research has proposed the conceptualization of burnout as a two-factor structure including only the emotional exhaustion and depersonalization components (Kalliath, O’Driscoll, Gillespie, & Bluedorn, 2000) while other research has relied solely on the emotional exhaustion subscale of the MBI tool (Aiken, Clarke, Sloane, Sochalski, & Silber, 2002). The point here is, while studies have measured burnout differently - the MBI tool and its three subscales are widely accepted as reliable and valid.

It is important to note that burnout possesses a rigorous theoretical definition, but a conceptually fragile theoretical distinction. Much research has been devoted to identifying the distinctive properties of burnout from other mental health conditions, particularly clinical depression. These studies have yielded mixed, inconclusive results that illustrate a degree of overlap between burnout and depression (Bianchi, Schonfeld, Laurent, 2015). What is conclusive, however, as Maslach and Jackson (1981) have indicated, is that burnout involves emotional exhaustion, where emotional exhaustion is a state that can be measured through valid and reliable tools.

In any event, burnout within professionals is an important concept to consider due to the nature of its consequences. For example, there exists a close relationship between burnout and diminished job performance (Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003). Likewise, it is clear that
burnout is harmful to the emotional and psychological well-being of the person who is experiencing it (Gulap, Karcıoğlu, Sari, & Köseoğlu, 2008).

**Measuring Burnout**

The most widely used instrument in measuring the burnout phenomenon is the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Schaufeli and Taris, 2005; Montero-Marín, et al., 2012). Schaufeli et al. (2001) concluded MBI to be effective at diagnosing cases of clinical burnout, but also to be effective in distinguishing burnout from other mental health conditions. This is a significant conclusion by the researchers, given that symptoms of burnout can sometimes mimic symptoms of various mental health conditions like depression, for example (Brenninkmeyer, Van Yperen, and Buunk, 2001).

Three categories are measured within the MBI instrument; emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Emotional exhaustion could be considered highly significant because of all three constructs that comprise burnout, emotional exhaustion is the only one that consistently predicts diminished job performance (Wright & Bonett, 1997; Janssen, Lam, & Huang, 2010). However, it is also important to note, emotional exhaustion alone is not a determinant of burnout, because emotional exhaustion could be a symptom of other mental illnesses unrelated to burnout (Schaufeli, Bakker, Hoogduin, Schaap, & Kladler, 2001). In other words, while emotional exhaustion is significant due to its negative impact on job performance, it should also be considered that emotional exhaustion could be the result of another mental health condition and not the result of burnout.

In this context, depersonalization becomes an appropriate concept when considering burnout because it clarifies the nature of burnout itself. Since depersonalization is generally
associated with a poor work-life balance (Shanafelt et al., 2015), it is thus a construct that facilitates the identification of burnout from simple emotional exhaustion that might be associated with other factors unrelated to burnout.

Personal accomplishment is a significant construct because it can be used to help predict resistance to burnout. The main idea here is that someone who is proud of their work and finds their work to be truly meaningful is at a lower risk for experiencing burnout (Henry, 2016). The personal accomplishment construct provides a sort of balance to the concept of burnout because it illustrates that burnout is a multidimensional phenomenon and is determined by the interplay of various factors and not determined by one sole factor. For example, one who is emotionally exhausted, but still finding value in the work they do would not, by definition, be experiencing burnout as opposed to someone who found no sense of meaning in their work. Taken together, then, these three constructs (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) define the concept of burnout in a precise manner. If taken within the context of a Venn diagram, for example, in which each individual circle represented each of the three burnout constructs, burnout would only occur when all three constructs existed, or in the space in which all three circles overlap.
Note. Burnout exists in the overlapping of all three constructs.

Interestingly, one survey item under the emotional exhaustion category refers to the term "burnout." It is important to note the term burnout is suggestive of a more significant condition and this is because burnout encompasses not only emotional exhaustion but the additional components of the aforementioned feelings of accomplishment and depersonalization (Farber, 1991; Schaufeli et al., 2001). This awareness is important with respect to the MBI tool. The point here is, the MBI tool indeed has validity in measuring burnout, and it could also be used to accurately decipher individuals experiencing burnout from those who are not.

Emotional Exhaustion

When examining burnout, attention should first be paid to emotional exhaustion and its connection to burnout, as a thorough exploration of such would shed valuable light on the significance of emotional exhaustion in the larger context of burnout. Maslach and Jackson (1981) have provided the following definition: "Burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that frequently occurs among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind. A
key aspect of burnout syndrome is increased feelings of emotional exhaustion" (p. 99). This
definition illuminates the connection between the phenomenon of burnout on the one hand and
feelings of emotional exhaustion on the other, such that it would be almost impossible to discuss
burnout meaningfully without also discussing the construct responsible for some of its key
negative effects - emotional exhaustion.

For example, studies have shown emotional exhaustion and burnout to have similar
effects on job performance and turnover. One such study by Wright and Cropanzano (1998)
surmisest emotional exhaustion to be predictive of a decline in job performance and an increase
in voluntary turnover. Cropanzano, Rupp, and Byrne (2003) built on this assertion, later finding
emotional exhaustion to also be predictive of work attitudes, and organizational citizenship
behaviors in addition to diminished outcomes. The results from these two regression analyses
suggest emotional exhaustion alone carries a host of negative effects for organizations and
workers. For this reason, preventing the onset of emotional exhaustion in workers should be a
key priority for organizations, not simply because emotional exhaustion carries with it such a
close connection to burnout in terms of effect, but because emotional exhaustion alone can do
harm within an institution.

Furthermore, Wright and Bonett (1997) found that of the three aspects of burnout -
emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization (Maslach and Jackson
1981) - it was only emotional exhaustion that was an actual predictor of diminished work
performance. In other words, these findings are in line with the notion that if a person suffering
from burnout is performing poorly at work, it is because they are experiencing emotional
exhaustion and not necessarily because they may also be experiencing depersonalization or
feeling unaccomplished. The conclusions of this study indicate a high depersonalization score in
the absence of a high emotional exhaustion score was not predictive of diminished work performance, which clearly implies that emotional exhaustion is central to the experience of burnout insofar as at least some of the negative effects of burnout, like diminished work performance, are primarily produced as the result of emotional exhaustion. The fundamental takeaway item here is that emotional exhaustion seems to be central to burnout in terms of effect. In this context then, it is entirely plausible to conclude that feeling “burned-out,” as it is commonly referred to, is essentially feeling emotionally exhausted and fatigued (Friedman, 2000). As feelings of burnout are feelings of emotional exhaustion and overextension (Kokkinos, 2007) - it is important to note, the term burnout, technically, is a more inclusive term that encompasses emotional exhaustion, personal accomplishment, and depersonalization.

**Depersonalization**

While emotional exhaustion comprises one-third of the burnout construct, it is logical to conclude not everyone who is emotionally exhausted is necessarily also experiencing burnout - so, because there exists the possibility that a professional can experience emotional exhaustion without experiencing burnout, it is necessary to discuss what distinguishes a case of burnout from a case of emotional exhaustion. Maslach and Jackson (1981) identified two additional components present within the burnout syndrome - the second of which involves the development of negative attitudes toward one's clients; a condition they refer to interchangeably as *depersonalization* and *cynicism* (p. 99). A social worker, for example, may reach a point of depersonalization in that they begin to believe their clients deserve the complications they are experiencing, or, in the case of a school teacher, they may become cynical in that they begin to develop negative attitudes about their students' ability to learn. Essentially, depersonalization, as depicted by Maslach and Jackson (1981), is characterized by the development of skepticism.
towards the people a professional works with - the first component, as discussed, is that of emotional exhaustion.

Like emotional exhaustion, depersonalization is foundational to burnout and this is due to the fact that when people are emotionally exhausted, they also tend to feel disconnected from their emotional self (He et al. 2017). In one study of oncologists, He et al. (2017) found that oncologists who worked in two separate roles (oncologists who also did psychosocial work) were less at risk for experiencing depersonalization as a result of burnout than oncologists who fulfilled just one single role (oncology). The main implication of this finding is that people tend to triangulate their own sense of identity, such that if there are two roles for feeling grounded in work, this tends to have a more stabilizing effect than having just one role. This seems somewhat counterintuitive, given that more roles would seem to imply more stress and thus, make burnout more likely. However, this finding reveals that there is, to some degree, a subjective element to the depersonalization aspect of burnout in that a person is somewhat protected from depersonalization if they possess what the researchers call a “psychosocial orientation” toward work or a connection to their work through different groups of people.

In a separate study, also of physicians, Shanafelt et al. (2015) suggest that a poor work-life balance tends to lead to the onset of depersonalization. This outcome implies that if a professional has a poor work-life balance, they tend to lose emotional equilibrium and this loss would likely end with the onset of depersonalization and the likely eventual onset of burnout.

In general terms, the literature seems to conclude that depersonalization tends to lead to burnout, but that depersonalization also tends to overlap with emotional exhaustion (Maslach, 1996). It is true these are unlike concepts, but it is also true that depersonalization generally does not occur in the absence of emotional exhaustion (West et al. 2009). In other words, it is difficult
to imagine a situation in which a worker would be experiencing negative, cynical views about the people they work with without also being emotionally exhausted and overextended. In this sense, depersonalization could be conceptualized as an exacerbation of emotional exhaustion, but one that a person who is not emotionally exhausted would be unlikely to experience. Depersonalization in and of itself, then, would seem to be a manifestation of emotional exhaustion, such that the professional develops a more callous attitude toward the people they work with (West et al., 2009).

In the continued analysis of depersonalization, a study by Ogus, Greenglass, and Burke (1990) indicates that for men, depersonalization results when there is a lack of a sense of camaraderie in the workplace, but more specifically, a lack of camaraderie in pursuing shared organizational goals and/or a lack of vision about what the goals actually are. Women, on the other hand, seemed to cope with this dimension of burnout by turning attention to social aspects within the workplace, such as personal relationships and friendships. This finding suggests that male employees, in particular, might be at an increased risk of experiencing depersonalization within the workplace if there is an absence of a clear sense of purpose. This finding is significant because it indicates the possibility of burnout to occur when goals and objectives are unclear.

More recent literature has examined the construct of depersonalization on its own merits. Considering depersonalization outside of its connection to emotional exhaustion is a necessary exploration, given that depersonalization has been found to negatively impact student motivation over the course of an academic semester (Shen et al., 2015). Survey data taken from 1302 high school students from two demographically similar urban school districts in the U.S. Midwest indicated a link between teacher depersonalization and decreased levels of intrinsic, or what the researchers refer to as autonomous, motivation. This study presents a significant finding,
considering a professional educator would only have to experience depersonalization to inflict harmful effects onto their students.

The consequences of teacher depersonalization also include a direct impact on student achievement and motivation. Research is virtually unanimous in support of the notion that positive teacher-student relationships foster positive academic outcomes for students (Wubbels and Brekelmans, 2005; Cornelius-White, 2007; Teven and McCroskey, 1997). Given this empirical understanding, it is logical to assume a depersonalized teacher with a negative disposition towards students would likely facilitate less favorable outcomes for students. This hypothesis was supported by Helm (2007) who concluded a teacher’s disposition toward students to not only affect academic performance but also to impact the self-esteem of a student. The study defined disposition as several critical attributes a teacher must possess in order for students to achieve. Helm (2007) includes kindness, caring, high expectations, and a strong work ethic in this group of required dispositions. This particular conclusion - that teacher disposition can impact student performance and self-esteem is noteworthy since teacher depersonalization would represent a cynical disposition toward students. A similar inquiry by Bergeron et al. (2011) adds further value to this point. Bergeron et al. (2011) found a negative teacher/student relationship to significantly impact a student’s intentions to drop out of school. These studies are of importance because their findings shed light on the detrimental effects the cynical views of a teacher, or a particular disposition can have within the classroom.

**Personal Accomplishment**

The research is clear that burnout leads to a low sense of accomplishment, such that a worker with a high sense of personal accomplishment will, all things being equal, not experience the effects of burnout. This understanding was supported by Henry (2016) who observed a trend
among physicians - as personal accomplishment decreased, burnout tended to increase. As personal accomplishment is the third dimension of burnout, the results of this study indicate that as feelings of accomplishment diminish, the risk of emotional exhaustion tends to increase; and on the basis of the previous key theme, so too, then, does the risk of depersonalization. As a result, it is possible to conceptualize an inverse relationship between personal accomplishment and emotional exhaustion, such that the less personally accomplished a worker feels, the more at risk the worker is to experiencing emotional exhaustion and thus, depersonalization and burnout.

The Henry (2016) study forces one to consider that a low sense of personal accomplishment may leave the door open for burnout to take its toll. Henry, in his report, suggests that in battling diminished feelings of accomplishment it may be effective to better recognize physicians for their hard work, as feeling personally accomplished is often determined, to some extent, by social recognition. That is, if a person is working hard, but does not feel properly recognized for their work, they may feel a lower sense of personal accomplishment, which may make emotional exhaustion more likely, which, as a result of its domino-like tendency, would make depersonalization more likely, and as a result, burnout would become more likely. The major consideration to be drawn here is that establishing a barrier against burnout might be possible by cultivating a sense of personal accomplishment among workers and that this emphasis on making workers feel accomplished may very well be key in burnout prevention.

It is worth turning attention to the relationship between motivation and personal accomplishment as motivation may also influence the way in which a given worker experiences feelings of personal accomplishment. For example, Barbuto (2005) has indicated that intrinsic motivation works in a fundamentally different way than extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic
motivation refers to the worker taking pride in their own work irrespective of external rewards and recognition, whereas extrinsic motivation refers to the worker primarily being driven by external rewards and recognition. In order to promote personal accomplishment within a given organization, then, it would be necessary to develop a coherent picture of the sources of motivation for workers within the organization. If the workers within an organization are primarily extrinsically motivated, it would be appropriate to develop new systems of rewards and recognition. On the other hand, if the workers tend to be intrinsically motivated, they are likely to develop feelings of autonomy and their own sense of pride in their work.

In addition to motivation, the concept of personal accomplishment inevitably leads into considerations of leadership, and as the relevant literature suggests, some leadership styles are more effective than others at cultivating a sense of personal accomplishment among workers. To this point, Goodwin, Whittington, Murray, and Nichols (2011) have indicated that a transformational leadership style is particularly effective at cultivating trust within an organization and thereby enabling employees to feel valued. This suggests that such a leadership style could help provide a buffer against employee burnout since the leadership style would promote feelings of personal accomplishment.

Boosting a sense of personal accomplishment among workers is an important premise to consider given that diminished personal accomplishment among professionals tends to lead to poor work performance (Shih et. al., 2013) as well as low self-efficacy (Evers et. al., 2002). This is a notable connection because it outlines the possibility of detrimental effects in the workplace as a result of a worker simply feeling unaccomplished. Though the Shih (2013) study was focused on information technology workers, it is conceivable to assume the results would likely hold true for professionals in education.
The Evers (2002) study, however, did extract survey data from a sample of 490 educators from the Netherlands. The results indicate a significant positive relationship between teacher self-efficacy and level of personal accomplishment. This connection makes low personal accomplishment amongst teachers a significant issue given that teacher efficacy has been positively associated with student achievement (Caprara et. al., 2006; Goddard et. al., 2000; Tschannen-Moran and Barr, 2004). Based on this conceptual framework then, a teacher with a low sense of personal accomplishment would not only be performing poorly in the classroom, which in and of itself would be an immense concern with respect to student achievement but would also be lacking confidence in their abilities to effectively navigate the duties associated with their job - making it logical to assume that a teacher with a diminished sense of accomplishment would likely hinder the achievement of their students.

Essentially, the three MBI subscales indicate burnout to be a response to prolonged and chronic interpersonal and emotional stress with each subscale manifesting unique effects. Emotional exhaustion, for example, tends to lead to a professional feeling fatigued and tired at work whereas depersonalization and low personal accomplishment lead to the development of hostility towards others and a lack of motivation, respectively. In broader terms, burnout refers to lost energy, enthusiasm, and confidence within the professional (Nguyen, 2011).

**Determinants of Teacher Burnout**

Given that burnout is considered a key precursor of turnover (Hughes, 2001) and both teacher burnout and teacher turnover bring deleterious effects to students (Ronfeldt, Loeb and Wyckoff, 2013) it would be worthwhile to study the specific theme of teacher burnout. To an extent, the phenomenon of teacher-coach burnout can be understood as a subset of teacher burnout in general; that is, teacher-coach burnout could be seen as a small circle within the larger
circle of teacher burnout. As teacher-coaches are teachers, an understanding of the dimensions of teacher burnout, in general, is important, even though teacher-coach burnout may have unique additional determinants that are not shared by all teacher burnout cases. These determinants unique to the situations of a teacher-coach will be examined later in this chapter.

One study on teacher burnout by Hultell, Mulin, and Gustavsson (2013) examined the various trajectories that burnout can take within a teacher's early career. Although the researchers concluded that individual cases were difficult to predict, burnout was not found to be a concern for teachers who "consistently showed signs of good mental health, good physical health, and educational success prior to entering employment," whereas "the opposite was true" for teachers who were generally vulnerable to burnout (p. 84). This suggests the phenomenon of teacher burnout may at least, to some extent, have a personal component. That is, there are some teachers, dependent on their own unique levels of wellness and experience, who may be considerably more susceptible to burnout than others. This supports the basic understanding that some possess the resiliency to encounter a difficult situation and thrive, while others seem to experience failure when faced with adversity.

There have been several studies dedicated to exploring the effect of personal characteristics on burnout. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2017), for example, have suggested that the underlying factors of burnout may be rooted in the relationship between stress and self-efficacy, with self-efficacy essentially acting as the antithesis of stress. For example, whereas stress is correlated with a higher risk of burnout and other negative outcomes, self-efficacy is correlated with a lower risk of burnout and other positive outcomes. The sheer volume of work that confronts a teacher, then, may not be the key variable that determines the extent to which a given teacher would be at risk of burnout. For example, a teacher with a high level of self-efficacy
could, in theory, handle a great deal of work without becoming stressed, whereas a teacher with a low level of self-efficacy may become stressed when confronted with lesser amounts. When considering the risk of experiencing burnout, then, it would not be enough to focus only on internal or external factors, rather consider the dynamic between the teacher and their environment.

Ventura, Salanova & Llorens (2015) have confirmed this relationship in their own study of teachers. In their quantitative analysis, it was found that teachers who reported higher levels of self-efficacy experienced obstacles as challenges, whereas teachers with lower levels of self-efficacy experienced obstacles as hindrances. This, in turn, led the high self-efficacy teachers to respond to their perceived challenges with engagement, whereas the low self-efficacy teachers tended to reach a point of emotional exhaustion, presumably because they perceived difficulty as a hindrance. This is a sophisticated conceptual dichotomy that has been developed by these researchers, and it essentially confirms that the presence of self-efficacy is a game-changer, so to speak, when it comes to the onset of burnout.

The effect of self-efficacy on burnout was also investigated by Schwarzer and Hallum (2008) with similar results. A mediation analysis of 1203 teachers determined job stress to mediate the relationship between self-efficacy and burnout, particularly in younger teachers. The second phase of this investigation, a one-year longitudinal study using structural equation modeling, confirmed another important hypothesis laid out in this review thus far - low self-efficacy precedes burnout. While the conclusions of this inquiry include the recommendation for further study into the relationships of self-efficacy, job stress, and burnout, the researchers affirm self-efficacy is a “protective resource” (p. 166) against job stress.
The literature also seems clear about the fact that the specific context of work for a teacher has a strong influence on burnout as well. One particular study by Hultell and Gustavsson (2011), for example, found that "job demands, job resources, and spillover between private life and work accounted for the largest amount of explained variance in both burnout and work engagement" (p. 85). This is a noteworthy study to reference as it presents an overlap between personal factors and job factors that might contribute to burnout. The results seem logical in the sense that as a teacher is expected to work hard to meet heavy demands, it can be expected that they will become more susceptible to burnout; and likewise, if a teacher is unable to keep their private life separate from their professional life, they would be robbed of any real opportunity to decompress, which could also easily catalyze and facilitate the onset of burnout. So, while there may be unique, personal aspects that contribute to burnout, such as work-life balance, it is also important to consider the effects of job context on burnout.

**Job Factors Affecting Burnout**

Lim and Eo (2014) have offered further evidence of the impact job factors can have on burnout. Their study examined Korean schools to identify the determinants of teacher burnout. They found organizational politics, or infighting among teachers as well as between teachers and administrators, to contribute to teacher burnout. This particular study also indicated higher levels of reflective dialogue and collective teacher efficacy to be associated with lower levels of teacher burnout. This too makes a great deal of sense. Essentially, these findings stipulate that teachers, when collectively empowered to address problems within their schools and when dialogue is focused around solving those problems, burnout levels go down; whereas when teachers feel like they are in competition for power and there is a general presence of ‘drama’ within the workplace, burnout levels go up.
Interestingly, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2014) have seemed to indicate that teacher burnout can emerge even within the context of a relatively positive occupational situation. For example, their research indicates that teacher-autonomy is a predictor not only of engagement and job satisfaction but also of emotional exhaustion. This finding would seem to suggest that a teacher who is highly autonomous, which on the surface is seemingly positive, may reach the point of emotional exhaustion as a result. This conclusion might suggest then, to a certain extent, teacher burnout may be unavoidable even within a positive occupational climate, and that burnout may simply be an inevitable part of the teaching profession. Emotional exhaustion, though, suggests that it would be possible for a teacher to recover by taking some time off or engaging in other activities, whereas burnout per se, as previously established, would only exist with the added presence of depersonalization and diminished accomplishment in addition to the emotional exhaustion.

When discussing teacher burnout, it would also be appropriate to discuss teacher stress, as stress is considered to be a contributing factor and possible precursor to exhaustion and burnout. According to O'Connor and Clarke (1990), there are multiple elements that can cause stress for teachers, including student factors, school-level, and community-level factors, and personal factors. The researchers in this particular study indicated, though, that the most common and most significant causes of stress for teachers were associated with pressures of time and workload. The main idea here is that if teachers are overworked, they experience stress, which will eventually lead to burnout if that same occupational climate persists. This general connection would seem to be lessened by personal and situational factors, including psychological resilience and the extent to which resources for addressing problems are available within the school or community.
Consequences and Prevention of Burnout

In any event, Shen et al. (2015) confirmed teacher burnout to have negative effects on not just the teacher but also on the students, which makes it an issue of the utmost significance. The research in this study suggests that there are multiple pathways present in this relationship, but that the key pathway consists of the influence that witnessing a teacher suffering from burnout has on the motivation of students. This would seem to be linked to the fact that the teacher unconditionally serves as a role model for students. So, if the students perceive that even the teacher cannot stay motivated or focused on the task at hand, then this might result in the students holding themselves to a lesser standard of motivation as well.

Conversely, though, it also seems that teachers' responses to student behavior may be related to teacher burnout. According to Chang (2013), the strategies used by teachers to cope with classroom incidents can have a significant effect on the incidence rate of teacher burnout. For example, if a teacher tends to react to a classroom disruption in a punitive manner and in a way that seems to escalate the situation, they would be more likely to reach a point of emotional exhaustion than if they were to manage their emotions more effectively and react to classroom disruptions with an eye toward diffusion and de-escalation. This link between emotional exhaustion and classroom management styles would seem to suggest that training teachers to respond to conflicts in more effective ways could possibly be a strategy for preventing the onset of burnout over a course of time. Again, the key dynamic here consists of burnout developing as a result of the nexus between the teacher and their work environment - neither the personal characteristics of the teacher nor the characteristics of the environment alone would be enough to predict burnout; rather, attention must be paid to the connection they have with one another.
Brouwers and Tomic (1999) also examined the domain of classroom management, but more specifically their research focused on the relationship between a teacher’s perceived self-efficacy in managing their classroom and the three dimensions of burnout. The results of this study of 243 secondary school teachers suggest perceived self-efficacy in classroom management had a longitudinal effect on the depersonalization domain of burnout and that influence was synchronous for the personal accomplishment domain as well (p. 250). Interestingly though, the direction of this relationship was reversed for the emotional exhaustion component of burnout. In conclusion, the researchers postulate that perceived self-efficacy in classroom management must be taken into consideration when devising interventions both to prevent and treat burnout in secondary-level teachers.

According to a meta-analysis carried out by Iancu et al. (2017), mindfulness interventions, especially when carried out over a timeframe of longer than one month, tended to have mitigating effects on rates of teacher burnout. Mindfulness refers to practices like meditation and conscious breathing that are designed to help the practitioner relax and gain some degree of perspective. It is fairly easy to see how mindfulness practices, when implemented in a coherent way as a professional intervention, could help relieve the effects of the chronic stress and negative emotions that tend to underlie the phenomenon of teacher burnout.

Luken and Sammons (2016) have confirmed this point, indicating that mindfulness interventions are in fact an effective way to reduce the levels of burnout experienced by teachers and healthcare professionals. Technically, this could also be considered a discussion of treatment strategies for teacher burnout, but in terms of prevention, what is important to note here is the fact that mindfulness interventions would actually be effective in addressing teacher burnout sheds some more light onto what the root causes of teacher burnout could really be. If
mindfulness interventions work, then this would seem to suggest that one of the determinants of burnout is insufficient mindfulness. This could be a situation in which teachers are not able to keep a proper perspective on their professional role, and in which they become too personally invested in the complications that might arise from the conflicts among stakeholders within the school setting. This would support the finding, for example, that organizational politics is positively correlated with teacher burnout (Lim & Eo, 2014).

Figure 3

Burnout Factors

Note. Three factors that contribute to teacher-burnout.

The preceding themes have focused on determinants of burnout for teachers in general because essentially, teacher-coaches are teachers with added responsibilities. Teacher-coaches could also be understood primarily as coaches or as a category all of their own, combining aspects of both teaching and coaching. That being said, the logical argument can be made that
the general factors that affect burnout among teachers would also clearly be applicable for teacher-coaches as well. These factors include personal characteristics, dynamics within the workplace, and a lack of mindfulness, with this last factor, again, being associated with the relationship between the individual teacher and their environment.

**Role Conflict**

There exists a wealth of research pertaining to role conflict - and this literature is significant because the findings on role conflict offer further insight into the possibility that a teacher-coach may be at an increased risk of experiencing burnout relative to a teacher. The previous themes were relevant because burnout is widely accepted as a key antecedent of turnover and both teacher burnout and teacher turnover cause deleterious effects on student motivation and performance, respectively, and because the literature on teacher burnout should also be applicable to teacher-coaches as teacher-coaches are part teacher. There is a significant amount of literature that exists between role conflict on one hand and burnout on the other and this literature is significant because there is, at face value at least, reason to believe that a teacher-coach would be likely to experience it, given that the teacher-coach by definition must occupy two fairly distinct, yet related roles. Since the literature is clear that role conflict should be considered an enhancer of burnout, an analysis of the literature pertaining to role conflict may thus be necessary for a more complete representation of teacher-coach burnout and the inherent disadvantages a teacher-coach may be exposed to.

Figone (1994) posited that the conflict to perform both roles of teacher and coach can cause conflict, either with alliances to one over the other or in finding the time and energy to perform both duties effectively. In a more general sense, role conflict occurs when there are contradictions between two or more roles a person may possess. In some cases, this conflict is
caused by opposing obligations which results in a conflict of interest. In other cases, role conflict
can occur when a person has roles that have different statuses (Crossman, 2017). Essentially, the
research on role conflict supports the notion that the dual roles of a teacher-coach produce
unique demands that can easily exacerbate emotional exhaustion and burnout.

Moss's (2015) findings, for example, found validity in this point among co-teachers
(general education and special education teachers who teach together in the same classroom). In
the study, role conflict was closely correlated with emotional exhaustion, which was
subsequently correlated with burnout. The main idea here is that within this specific context,
teachers did not necessarily know what professional roles they were supposed to fulfill. For
example, a co-teacher may be expected to work in collaboration with another teacher rather than
independently as they may have become accustomed to; and they also had to shift gears, so to
speak, between teaching in one way to one set of students and in another way to another set of
students. It is easy to see how this can catalyze confusion and stress within professionals,
especially in the event that they were not previously accustomed to this type of role ambiguity.
Ambiguity does not necessarily always lead to conflict, but it undeniably acts as a precursor to
conflict and its presence undoubtedly generates an increased potential for it; whereas conversely,
in the absence of role ambiguity, there could be no role conflict, since there would not be
multiple and divergent demands of the role itself.

Furthermore, a quantitative study by Olivares-Faundez et al. (2014) found role conflict to
be closely correlated with professional burnout. The key mechanism here would seem to consist
of the basic fact that when one's role is ambiguous and/or complex, more emotional energy is
spent on navigating that ambiguity than if one's role were simple and straightforward. In
addition, the researchers also found burnout to be a strong predictor of employee absenteeism. So
in theory, a sequence has emerged: a sequence that starts at role conflict, moves to exhaustion and burnout, then moves to absenteeism. This study specifically focused on health workers, but there seems to be no real reason to believe that these findings would not apply to other professions as well, especially other professions like teaching that also include intensively working with people.

Role conflict could also be understood in terms of the potential imbalance between the personal role and the professional role. For example, Derks and Bakker (2012) have explored the relationship between burnout and what they call “work-home interference.” This term refers to the seemingly more modern-day phenomenon of allowing one's professional life to invade one's personal life; a trend that has been catalyzed and exacerbated by the advent of more recent modern technologies including the smartphone. The researchers found that work-home interference was strongly correlated with burnout and that this relationship, interestingly, was seen to be most prevalent among the most avid smartphone users. The researchers have suggested that this was because the avid smartphone users were unable to "unplug" from their work and that this not only caused a type of overload in their professional life but also led to new stressors in their personal life. This could be interpreted as a form of role conflict that is, at least to some extent, a result of the advances in modern technology as well as the collective movement toward a more technologically dependent culture.

Like Derks and Bakker (2012), Lin et al. (2014) also examined the conflict between professional and personal roles. Their key findings include what they call “work-leisure conflict” and its definitive enhancement to the risk of experiencing job burnout, also its abatement of a sense of well-being. Again, this is somewhat different from experiencing a conflict of roles within the professional domain alone, but one can extrapolate that the psychological conflicts are
more or less the same: a person trying to be both a teacher and a coach may experience tensions that are similar to a person who is trying to be both a lawyer and a mother, for example. In both cases, burnout is the result of an imbalance, with the professional being unable to perform at a high level if the imbalance is prolonged and not addressed effectively. In short, the conclusion can be drawn that when a person experiences conflicts amid the different roles that he/she is expected to fulfill, it can lead to emotional exhaustion, and thus burnout.

It would seem though, that enhanced occupational autonomy might serve to mitigate the effects of emotional exhaustion. Examining the employees of a bank, Belias et al. (2015) found that although role conflict was correlated with employee burnout, burnout was diminished by the presence of enhanced autonomy. That is, the greater the autonomy of the employee, the more effectively the employee was able to manage their role conflict in a productive way, and the lesser the effect of role conflict on employee burnout. This seemingly confirms the notion that autonomy and self-efficacy are antithetical to stress and burnout: as one increases, the other tends to decrease. Again though, one must understand that burnout is not just a function solely of the circumstances, but more of a function of the relationship between those circumstances and the capacity of the professional to cope with them. If there is potential within a professional or within the environment to navigate the challenges of role conflict, the role conflict may not necessarily lead to burnout, or at least not to as severe a level. What applies to burnout would then seem to apply to the precursor of burnout known as role conflict: self-efficacy is capable of essentially negatively impacting the onset of burnout.

Given this concept, it becomes reasonable to assert that even in situations in which burnout is not a serious concern, attention should be given to addressing instances of role conflict, due to the fact that role conflict is a key antecedent of burnout and would likely develop
into burnout if it is not effectively addressed. This was precisely the conclusion, for example, in a study of medical volunteers by Phillips, Andrews, and Hickman (2014). The researchers concluded that within the context of their specific inquiry, burnout was not a serious issue, but they did identify the potential for role conflict to occur. The researchers thus recommended that although there were no burnout-related problems yet, preventative interventions aimed at impeding the emergence of role conflict should be implemented proactively.

The underlying conceptual verity is that a teacher-coach, because of their dual-natured position, will be more greatly exposed to role conflict than a teacher - and this elevated exposure puts them at an inherently higher risk of experiencing burnout.

**Teacher-Coach Burnout**

Few studies have explored the relationship between burnout and teacher-coaches. A teacher-coach is defined as a teacher who performs both the role of teacher and of a coach on at least one of the school interscholastic athletic teams. When they aren't performing their duties as a teacher, a teacher-coach will work primarily as a coach after school hours. This added responsibility can result in a workweek well over 40 hours as working nights, holidays, evenings and weekends are common for high school coaches. Additionally, a teacher-coach may coach several different sports throughout the school year depending on their official position within the school.

One of the few studies to examine the relationship of a teacher-coach and burnout was conducted by Richards (2013), and this study, in particular, is foundational to the inquiries of this investigation. Richards’ (2013) probed the levels of burnout, role stress, and resilience in 415 teachers from three adjacent school districts in the U.S. Midwest. The participants were split among the elementary, middle, and high school levels. The survey data collected yielded mixed
results that do not permit one to make a definitive conclusion one way or the other. It should not be assumed, however, that the teacher-coach will always experience higher levels of burnout and role stress than the non-coaching teacher. In addition, interestingly, with respect to the three constructs measured in the study, the conclusion was drawn that teacher-coaches and non-coaching teachers share a greater amount of similarities in these areas than differences - specifically in the area of burnout. Richards concluded that “additional research is needed to more fully comprehend the implications for a teacher-coach” - an acknowledgment that is central to the basis for this investigation.

Furthermore, in terms of burnout, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to test the relationships between observed variables and latent constructs. The CFA for the MBI-ES indicated an adequate fit (929.15). The observed t-values ranged from 3.94 to 20.57 and were considered significant. 2x2 (coaching status x subject affiliation) factorial ANOVA was also conducted for the burnout variable. Coaching status was shown to be an insignificant main effect on emotional exhaustion, as was the main effect of subject affiliation. There was, however, a significant interaction effect between coaching status and subject affiliation. The 2x2 Factorial ANOVAs also yielded insignificant main and interaction effects for role conflict, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

The culmination of the Richards (2013) study yielded several key conclusions relevant to the basis of this study. The first of which is that role conflict not only exists in teacher-coaches, but it exists to an even greater extent in teacher-coaches of core academic subjects relative to teacher-coaches of non-core academic subjects. Secondly, burnout did not vary significantly between teacher-coaches and non-coaching teachers - and furthermore, depersonalization and personal accomplishment dimensions of burnout were not significantly impacted by coaching
status. Emotional exhaustion, however, was experienced by teacher-coaches of core academic subjects to a greater extent than teacher-coaches of non-core academic subjects. Independent sample t-tests confirmed this relationship between teachers of core academic subjects and emotional exhaustion.

These conclusions indicate that teacher-coaches of core academic subjects tend to experience higher amounts of role stress and emotional exhaustion compared to teacher-coaches of non-core academic subjects, but that the teacher-coach, on average, does not experience a dissimilar level of burnout than the non-coaching teacher. This was not an unexpected uncovering, as this project proposes that teacher-coaches experience similar levels of burnout than non-coaching teachers despite the inherently higher levels of role stress/conflict. The Richards (2013) study also affirms the notion of another potential factor at play: an unknown factor that seemingly protects a teacher-coach from experiencing a higher rate of burnout than the non-coaching teacher - and a factor that no study has yet to explore.

While certain conclusions can be drawn from the Richards (2013) study, there are several limitations that must be considered when interpreting the results. For one, limitations exist within the population of the study. A low response rate of 31.17%, for example, could be partially responsible for the results as a higher response rate may have led to more generalizable results. Second, the sample was also skewed towards older teachers with nearly 55% of participating teachers being over the age of 40, and an average teaching experience of 16.87 years. This is a significant detail as younger teachers transitioning into the teaching workforce may experience burnout differently than their older, more-seasoned colleagues. Lastly, the sample was made up of more women than men - and was almost exclusively composed of Caucasian teachers. As
such, it is reasonable to assert the findings of the study may be more applicable to older, white female teachers than the more generalized teaching force.

It is also worth turning attention to the cross-sectional nature of the study as a possible limitation. It is possible that burnout varies according to the time of year, and whether or not the teacher-coach was in-season at the time of survey completion. Both qualitative and longitudinal designs could provide more insight into this relationship than the present project’s single administration of a survey. In addition, future studies could examine the potentials of hidden variables like social support, motivation, and job satisfaction and the potential impact on burnout.

There is literature available on the specific challenges teacher-coaches may experience, and what may lead to the onset of burnout. Same as Figone (1994), Sage (1984) found teacher-coaches to be more susceptible to higher levels of role conflict, where role conflict in this area is defined as "the experience of role stress and role strain due to the conflicting multiple demands of teaching and coaching" (p. 29). In other words, teaching requires one particular set of skills, and coaching requires another particular set of skills; and teacher-coaches are, by nature, required to not only possess competence in both of these sets of skills but also to balance these contrasting responsibilities effectively. Given the conceptual framework that has been sketched over the course of the preceding themes thus far, there is a strong reason to believe that this type of role conflict could catalyze burnout if left unaddressed.

Schwab and Iwanicki (1982) have confirmed this assumption - that role conflict can lead to burnout. Their study indicated a statistically significant variance in feelings of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. The study also concluded that role conflict has a direct impact
on the three aspects of burnout, individually. The results of the study are significant because they essentially confirm the proposition that burnout can originate from role conflict.

In trying to conceptualize the role conflict that would be experienced by the teacher-coach, Richards and Templin (2012) have advocated for the adoption of a "multidimensional" perspective. These researchers have acknowledged the basic core structure of the conflict to be that teacher-coaches may feel the pressure to prioritize either being a teacher or being a coach, which could result in a drop in quality of the role that has not been prioritized. However, the researchers also insisted that it is important to consider the way in which teacher-coaches view themselves, as well as the social context within which the teacher-coach operates. For example, if the teacher-coach is expected to perform first and foremost as a teacher by their school, but their primary passion lies in the coaching component of the role, any tensions that may already exist as a result of the dual demands of the two roles themselves could easily be exacerbated.

Along the same lines, Konukman et al. (2010) have emphasized the way in which teaching physical education and coaching, while seemingly similar on the surface, are different and distinct professional roles: "Teaching and coaching are different occupational roles in terms of instructional objectives, motivation, student skill sets, time devoted and facilities" (p. 21). This can make it problematic for the teacher-coach to fulfill both roles effectively. This is especially the case because the teacher-coach himself, as well as the people surrounding him, may have the misconception that teaching and coaching are similar and that there should be little or no complications experienced as a result of the similarity. This means that role conflict could emerge within a context in which no one, including the teacher-coach, is expecting it to. This could exacerbate the risk of burnout, in the event a problem is not even acknowledged to exist or
taken seriously on its own terms, it would be that much more difficult for any professional in this type of situation to address it in a meaningful way.

Millslagle and Morley (2004) have proposed that teacher-coaches may engage in what is called role retreatism, possibly as a defense against role conflict and burnout. For example, the researchers noted that many teacher-coaches showed a marked disinterest, relative to normal teachers, with engaging in professional development and professional organizations related to teaching. Rather, many teacher-coaches seemed to be far more interested in their roles as coaches than in their roles as teachers, especially during the competitive seasons for their sports. This is potentially a way for teacher-coaches to minimize role conflict: after all, if the conflict is between the two elements of teaching on one hand and coaching on the other, then an effective way to alleviate that conflict would be to emotionally withdraw from one or the other of these roles. However, it is quite logical to consider this solution to be less than ideal, as it essentially suggests a blatant disregard for half of the duties a teacher-coach is expected to fulfill. In this particular investigation, it was found that roughly only 40% of teacher-coaches engaged in role retreatism - making the concept of role retreatism a possibility worthy of further investigation, and not a certainty.

Andrew and Richards (2015) have discussed the potential ways in which the socialization of the PE teacher may have an effect on the burnout of teacher-coaches. Their research concludes PE teacher-coaches may experience both benefits and drawbacks from the nature of their role. For example, some fail to think of Physical Education as a "real" subject (Carlson, 1994), which would perhaps actually diminish role conflict by allowing such a teacher-coach to think of himself primarily as a coach and not as a teacher. On the other hand, though, if the teacher-coach
were a PE teacher, the teaching responsibilities associated with this role may be ignored or disregarded by others, which could easily catalyze role conflict and ultimately lead to burnout.

In any event, for teacher-coaches of any subject in the school setting, it is clear that role conflict is a common challenge. This has been reported, for example, in a field study conducted by Sage (1987): "The observations and interviews demonstrate quite dramatically the complexity and pervasiveness of role overload and inter-role conflict in this occupation and the role strain that results" (p. 213). Again, according to the emerging conceptual framework in this review, there is a strong reason to believe that role conflict is a precursor to burnout, which itself could then be considered a precursor to turnover since burnout is a key antecedent and strong predictor of turnover. This being the case, if role conflict is prevalent among teacher-coaches, then it would seem to logically follow that teacher-coaches may be especially at risk for burnout and eventual turnover. This would be because the teacher-coach would not only need to fulfill all the responsibilities of a teacher but would also be expected to fulfill all the additional responsibilities of the coach, while also keeping both these roles well-balanced.

It is worth considering, once again, the actuality that teaching and coaching are distinct roles, and that the teacher-coach is forced to essentially be two professionals in one. Bain and Wendt (1983) found, for example, that when students majoring in physical education were surveyed, there were distinct differences between students who primarily reported an interest in teaching and those who primarily reported an interest in coaching, with male students being more likely to report a primary interest in coaching and female students being more likely to report a primary interest in teaching. As a result, it would seem that there are very few teacher-coaches who view the two elements of their role in a well-balanced way. Rather, what seems to be more often the case, teacher-coaches may focus on the teaching with the coaching being an
added responsibility or may focus on the coaching with the teaching being an additional responsibility. This potentially makes the dynamics of role conflict even more unclear, as the teacher-coaches would not possess a view of themselves as teacher-coaches, but as primarily one or the other.

This point is fully supported by Kosa (1990), who suggests in no uncertain terms that there are fundamental incompatibilities between the role of teacher and the role of coach and that the teacher-coach is the one who experiences the brunt of this tension. The basic point is that in most school settings, the teacher-coach is not one synthesized role, but the combination of two separate roles with two separate, unique sets of demands. This mixture of roles can produce a high-stress situation, which can have the effects of catalyzing role conflict, emotional exhaustion, then burnout, and eventually turnover. Following this conceptual chain, one might consider the more appropriate question to be not why teacher-coach burnout occurs, but why teacher-coach burnout does not occur more often.

The previous few cited sources have been older ones, for the simple reason that there would seem to be no more recent literature that has analyzed the problem of teacher-coach burnout in such a thorough manner. For example, Kelley and Gill (1993) studied the specific factors that contribute to burnout among teacher-coaches at the college level, with findings that echo much of what has already been discussed. It was found that role conflict was a major source of stress, which in turn became a source of burnout. Research that specifically addresses burnout among teacher-coaches has most definitely fallen by the wayside over recent times, with only a few recent studies on this specific topic turning up. It is unclear why this is the case as the specific problem of burnout and turnover in the teaching profession seems to be higher now than ever before.
It is worth referring to an interesting study that seems to suggest that when it comes to coaching, burnout may actually lead to positive outcomes. Price and Weiss (2000) found that coaches suffering from emotional exhaustion were more likely to engage in democratic decision making as opposed to autocratic decision-making, which was related to improved perceptions among athletes. However, it was also the case that emotionally exhausted coaches were less likely to insist on intensive training, and this was associated, logically, with diminished performance. The conclusion would appear simply that exhausted coaches were not all that committed to doing much of anything. For the situation of the teacher-coach, then, it is important to consider that burnout might diminish performance as a coach; and it has already been established that burnout diminishes performance as a teacher. The point here being that if there are some ironic, roundabout advantages that come from burnout, it should not be interpreted that burnout is actually desirable in any way.

In a qualitative study of two experienced female teacher-coaches, Drake and Hebert (2002) found that the stress of a teacher-coach can come from multiple sources. In particular, four key dimensions can be identified. The first is intra-role stress or stress that emerges as a result of the specific responsibilities of being a teacher or being a coach. The second is inter-role stress or the stress that emerges from having to balance being both a teacher and a coach. The third is inter-domain stress or the stress that emerges from having to balance a professional life with personal life. And the fourth is environmental stress or the stress that emerges from macro-level factors affecting a school. Of course, most professionals have to deal with several of these dimensions of stress all at once, but the stress of a teacher-coach would seem to be exacerbated specifically by the dimension of inter-role conflict, which would not, of course, be experienced by professionals who occupy only one single role.
The main conclusion that emerges from this key theme, then, is that if teachers are experiencing high levels of stress and reach a point of being ‘stressed out,’ then teacher-coaches must be even more stressed out. This theme then would seem to suggest teacher-coaches would experience higher levels of burnout than teachers. This conclusion seems to be a logical one, on the basis of what has been discussed above. The conceptual framework that emerges on the basis of the analysis of burnout reveals that role conflict can lead to burnout and obviously teacher-coaches experience a high risk of role conflict; as is evident in their hyphenated label. This finding was somewhat unexpected, and the reason this was so will emerge in the upcoming theme of this review.

Organizational Commitment

Thus far, this literature review would seem to contradict one of the main hypotheses of this work, which is that teacher-coaches would experience an equal or lesser amount of burnout than non-coaching teachers. This hypothesis becomes improbable if the primary finding thus far is that teacher-coaches are more exposed to greater amounts of stress and role conflict and as a result of that increased exposure, are naturally prone to higher levels of burnout. Therefore, it is necessary to turn attention to discussing organizational commitment, a construct that may have opposing effects on burnout within teacher-coaches.

Before discussing organizational commitment and its potential buffering effect on burnout, it is essential to illustrate why it is that a teacher-coach may be subject to higher levels of organizational commitment relative to teachers in the first place. In a study of 724 college head-coaches, Turner (2001) found affective commitment levels to be higher than normative and continuance commitment levels. These results indicate this particular stratified sample of coaches were committed to their organization, not because they felt they had to be, but because
they wanted to remain there. This finding is an important one - and it is one that is central to the
assertion that teacher-coaches may possess higher levels of organizational commitment.

In a study by King and Sethi (1997), for example, it was found that organizational
commitment had a diminishing effect on burnout. This meant that while there was a causal
relationship between certain stressors and the onset of burnout, organizational commitment
strongly affected the magnitude of this relationship. This would mean that a professional with a
higher level of organizational commitment would experience considerably less burnout than a
professional with a low level of organizational commitment. Thus, it would seem that
organizational commitment acts as a type of buffer to burnout. It does not necessarily make a
professional immune to burnout, but it does soften the blow, so to speak, and enables a
professional to experience only a minimal or perhaps even negligible amount of burnout.

Studying staff at a correctional facility, however, Griffins et al. (2010) found that
organizational commitment actually had no effects on levels of burnout. It is unclear whether this
finding is atypical, as one would expect a commitment to an organization to produce a morale
boost in the employee that could potentially protect them from experiencing burnout or at least
experiencing it at such a severe level. In other words, common sense would seem strongly in line
with the findings reported by King and Sethi (1997). So, what could be called the buffer theory
of organizational commitment seems to be one that would hold true for the cases of most
professionals, and perhaps the findings of Griffins et al. (2010) were determined, to some extent,
to be an outlier or due to extraneous factors within the specific setting of the study.

This line of inquiry is important when considering the situation of a teacher-coach
because it could provide a foundation for supporting the main hypotheses of this study (that
organizational commitment has a moderating effect on burnout), despite the contrary evidence
regarding stress, role conflict, and burnout. The point here is this: if teacher-coaches experience higher levels of organizational commitment than non-coaching teachers as a result of being involved with their organization in two capacities and not just one (as a coach and a teacher), then teacher-coaches may be able to leverage the buffering effect of organizational commitment in order to manage their higher levels of stress in a more effective way than may be possible for non-coaching teachers who might possess lower levels of organizational commitment. This hypothesis admittedly places a high significance on the extent to which organizational commitment is present in teacher-coaches and the extent to which it might have an adverse effect on burnout in a professional, however, understanding this conceptual possibility gives further legitimacy to the following fundamental inquiries of this project:

I. Do teacher-coaches experience less burnout than teachers?
II. To what extent is organizational commitment related to being a teacher-coach?
III. Does organizational commitment have a moderating effect on burnout in a teacher-coach?

Moreover, the answers to these questions would enable one to move into a more comprehensive exploration of the legitimacy of the buffer theory of organizational commitment as the counterpoint to the notion that teacher-coaches experience higher levels of role conflict and thus, burnout.

In any event, the literature is clear about the fact that organizational commitment is antithetical to employee turnover, and this is noteworthy in view of the fact that burnout tends to precede turnover. Blau and Boal (1987) have analyzed the ways in which job involvement and organizational commitment affect the dependent variables of absenteeism and turnover among employees. The article is fairly sophisticated in its conceptualization of the different variations
that can occur as a result of the presence or absence of job involvement and organizational commitment. The main conclusion is that the presence of both organizational commitment and job involvement is most predictive of lower rates of absenteeism and turnover. It makes sense that if a given professional loves their job and is loyal to their organization, it becomes quite unlikely they will decide to leave their organization. Organizational commitment, though, is more predictive of lower turnover on its own than job involvement is on its own. This also makes sense, since it suggests that if a person loves their job, they will more likely than not want to keep it, but they may also try to find better employment with other organizations. For the intents and purposes of this study, the noteworthy point would be that for teacher-coaches, a high level of organizational commitment and/or job involvement would be predictive of lower rates of turnover.

Somers (1995) also concluded that a high level of affective commitment to an organization to be highly predictive of a low rate of employee turnover. The reason why seems logical: after all, affective commitment is more or less synonymous with loyalty, and a person who feels loyal to an organization would be very unlikely to leave it on their own volition. A question that emerges, then, is: what is the nature of the affective commitment of teacher-coaches to their schools, relative to the level of affective commitment experienced by non-coaching teachers? If affective commitment for teacher-coaches were significantly higher, this could potentially support the hypothesis that teacher-coaches experience less burnout than their non-coaching counterparts.

This project will be the first to explore affective commitment in teacher-coaches relative to teachers as no such study has yet been carried out, but it is necessary to first establish the
conceptual possibility that a teacher-coach would be expected to experience higher commitment. This viewpoint has both empirical and conceptual footing.

In probing the organizational and occupational commitment of college head coaches, Turner (2001) contended a high degree of organizational commitment existed among a stratified sample of 724. Furthermore, the data suggested that affective commitment yielded the highest score of the three components used to measure organizational commitment - essentially suggesting an elevated sense of loyalty among this particular sample of coaches. The results of this study serve as a foundation to the notion that a significant degree of organizational commitment exists in coaches, a notion further validated by the indication these coaches were committed to and remaining in their position primarily through feelings of loyalty. Essentially, these findings suggest collegiate coaches are committed and loyal to the schools in which they work, and if enhanced commitment and loyalty exist in college coaches, it is reasonable to assume a similar sense of commitment and loyalty might exist in coaches at the high school level.

In continuing the framework suggesting a teacher-coach might be subject to enhanced commitment, it is also worth turning some attention to the relevant literature on motivation and performance. Barbuto (2005), for example, has discussed the advantages that accrue as a result of having intrinsic motivation, or feeling genuinely committed to and taking pride in one's work, as opposed to extrinsic motivation, or having a more mercenary mindset where the importance lies in meeting minimum requirements and earning a paycheck. It could be hypothesized here that intrinsic motivation would be correlated with organizational commitment, as long as a professional feels loyal to their organization, they would likely feel more inclined to go above
and beyond for it, since they would view the successes of the organization, to some degree, as their own personal success.

Additionally, it is worth noting that at many schools, sports teams and their victories develop an almost patriotic fervor among stakeholders within those schools. Foley (2010), for example, has discussed in-depth how important the culture of high school football is to shaping the identities of entire communities within the state of Texas. In this context, it could be further assumed that the teacher-coach, by participating in the school’s athletic programs, develops an enhanced sense of what is commonly called “school spirit”, compared to teachers who are not involved in the school’s athletic programs. School spirit could then catalyze intrinsic motivation since the identity of the teacher-coach would to some extent merge with the identity of the school. According to the emerging conceptual framework of this review, this would mean that organizational commitment could also be enhanced and that the teacher-coach might then be shielded from the more significant manifestations of burnout that affect non-coaching teachers.

**Conclusion**

The key themes of this literature review provide an adequate foundation for developing a rational context for the present study. First, the point should be made that a weighty portion of this literature review has focused on the phenomenon of teacher and teacher-coach burnout and that this is significant, given that burnout among professionals is correlated with diminished job performance. There exists added significance in the reality that the literature is clear about the connection between teacher burnout and diminished performance in students. Thirdly, the analysis of burnout is significant because there is a strong connection between burnout and turnover, with teacher turnover producing additional adverse effects on students. This relationship is supported both by relevant evidence and by common sense. Essentially, it means
that when an employee is exhausted, depressed, and reaches a point in which they fail to find continued meaning in the work that they are doing, they are at great risk for declined performance and eventually, leaving their position. Therefore, when considering the issue of burnout among teacher-coaches, it is very appropriate to mention the connection between burnout and turnover.

From this point onward, it logically follows that an examination of burnout among teachers, in general, would be an effective way to shed light on the phenomenon of burnout among teacher-coaches in particular. This is justified by the observation that a teacher-coach is a specific type of teacher, such that what is applicable to the broad group of teachers would also be applicable to the specific subgroup of teacher-coaches. In other words, "teacher" could be understood as a big circle, and "teacher-coach" could be understood as a smaller circle within that big circle. The examined literature is clear on the point that the teacher-coach is not exactly a unique position entirely, rather a role formed through a mixture of the roles of teacher and coach. So, in theory, what could be said about teachers in general and coaches, in general, could also be said about teacher-coaches in particular, although the teacher-coach would also have unique qualifications to consider.

An important point that emerged in the consideration of teacher burnout was that burnout cannot be explained strictly by internal or external factors alone. That is, burnout would seem a phenomenon that is caused as a result of the relationship between internal and external factors. There is no definitive amount of stress that would cause burnout; rather, the onset of burnout may be better understood as an equation that accounts for the amount of resilience possessed by the teacher minus the amount of stress present within the environment. If the result of that equation were a positive number, so to speak, then burnout would not occur, whereas if the result
were a negative number, then burnout would occur. The takeaway is that stress in and of itself is not an adequate determination of burnout - rather, burnout is a function of the relationship between the existing stress and the internal resources possessed by the teacher to deal with that stress.

Furthermore, it would seem that role conflict likely leads to emotional stress, whereas emotional stress leads to burnout, which means that role conflict increases the potential risk for a professional to experience burnout. Additionally, research suggests it is safe to assume that the teacher-coach would experience a much greater level of role conflict than the non-coaching teacher, given that the teacher-coach is essentially expected to fulfill two professional roles, whereas the non-coaching teacher is expected to perform only one. As a result, theoretically, there is a solid reason to believe that the teacher-coach would be at a much greater risk of burnout than the non-coaching teacher, to the degree that the teacher-coach is likely to deal with a separate, additional source of stress (role conflict) that the non-coaching teacher does not. The teacher-coach is affected by all the factors that affect the non-coaching teacher, including conflicts between professional life and personal life; but the teacher-coach is additionally and uniquely affected by role conflict.

Much of this literature review, then, would seem to flatly contradict the main hypothesis of the study, which is that teacher-coaches experience equal or lesser levels of burnout than non-coaching teachers. The causal chain of burnout runs from stress to exhaustion to burnout, however, role conflict has also been found to be independently related to burnout, probably because it presents a professional with an additional layer of stress to navigate. This would mean that being a coach in addition to being a teacher would exacerbate the risk of burnout, relative to just being a teacher. This is an empirical point, just as it is a logical one.
One of the key points made from the examination of the literature is that the role of teacher-coach is not a disconnected role, but a balance of what are, essentially, two separate professional roles, with any given teacher-coach perhaps feeling more like a teacher or more like a coach, with that balance possibly shifting over time. As a result, the teacher-coach could be expected to consistently experience role confusion, as well as being exposed to the misperceptions of others regarding the nature and expectations of his work. This breed of conflict would likely form an independent source of stress. Therefore, it would logically follow that the teacher-coach is likely, on average, subject to more stress than the non-coaching teacher; and because stress is related to burnout, the logical conclusion would be that teacher-coaches are at greater risk of burnout.

Figure 4

Stress and Burnout

Note. Role conflict uniquely leads to burnout in teacher-coaches.
However, this logic has so far only examined the conceptual equation from one side, and there is another side worthy of investigation. In order to fully understand this side of the equation, it is important to remember that burnout is not a standalone variable but a product: that is, burnout is determined by the relationships amidst internal and external variables. This means that even if the variable of stress may be elevated for a teacher-coach, this does not necessarily mean that the teacher-coach will be at a greater risk of burnout, in the case that the teacher-coach might possess certain internal variables that may very well offset the effects of that elevated stress. If this were the case, then it would mean that higher levels of stress, while a liability, would not in and of itself be adequate for determining the actual risk of a teacher-coach experiencing burnout.

Again, the foundation for this basic point has already been established by the key theme discussing the determinants of burnout among non-coaching teachers. Over the course of that discussion, it was found that stress alone was not enough to determine burnout and that stress instead had to be considered within its relationship to resilience and self-efficacy. The fact is that a teacher with a high level of self-efficacy can, in theory, handle a large amount of stress without experiencing burnout and that conversely, a teacher with a low level of self-efficacy may not be able to handle even a small amount of stress without experiencing burnout. When considered in and of itself, stress has almost become a meaningless variable then, and this is due to the obvious point that different professionals deal with stress in more or less effective ways than others, and that an effective stress management strategy could even prevent stress from following the previously discussed causal chain and thus eventually resulting in burnout.

This is why the final theme of this literature review has focused on the potential advantages of the teacher-coach and turned attention to the variable of organizational
commitment. The literature would seem to clearly indicate that higher levels of organizational commitment are associated with lower levels of burnout and employee turnover. This relationship seems completely logical: if an employee feels loyalty towards his organization, then it would seem to logically follow that that employee would be more reluctant to experience emotional exhaustion and eventually leave that organization. This is exactly what the evidence on the subject seems to suggest: the greater the level of organizational commitment, intrinsic motivation, and job involvement, the lower the risk of burnout and turnover.

This forms an extremely important addition to the conceptual framework that has been sketched thus far. That framework has suggested that there is a causal chain that runs from stress to burnout to turnover, with role conflict being one of the several sources of stress. However, there is literature that suggests that there exists another key player, so to speak, with regard to the onset of burnout in a professional - a key player that has yet to be examined in teacher-coaches: organizational commitment. Quite simply, what can be drawn from this is that there are factors that enhance the risk of burnout; but then, there may also be factors that have the potential to mitigate the risk of burnout. In order to address the actual and real risk of burnout affecting any given professional, then, it would be necessary to understand not just the sources and degrees of stress involved in the situation, but also the other factors that may have the capacity to moderate and/or even counteract the effects of stress. It’s important to understand that these moderating factors could bring the level of stress, as it is actually experienced by the professional, well below the threshold in which it would begin to cause burnout.

There is a reason to believe that the teacher-coach may have advantages in this regard that the non-coaching teacher does not. For example, it has been noted in this review that sports teams are an important part of school spirit and that the teacher-coach is by definition involved
with the athletic teams of a school. Could this involvement result in a greater level of identification with the school by the teacher-coach than that by the non-coaching teacher? And if that is the case, is it possible that the teacher-coach would also experience a significantly higher level of organizational commitment? If the answer is yes, it is plausible to believe that the hypothesis presented earlier that organizational commitment has a moderating effect on burnout in teacher-coaches may hold true, and that teacher-coaches may in fact, in the end, experience lesser or equal levels of burnout than non-coaching teachers despite being faced with significantly greater stress.

The above literature review presumes that teacher-coaches are exposed to considerably higher levels of stress than non-coaching teachers. That is, all things being equal, the teacher-coach does have additional sources of stress, especially pertaining to role conflict, that the non-coaching teacher simply does not. The one question that remains, though, is whether teacher-coaches also have access to unique sources of burnout mitigation, like organizational commitment for example, that non-coaching teachers do not, and whether the magnitude of this advantage, assuming it exists, is enough to outweigh the disadvantage of greater stress and role conflict. The evidence presented in the above literature review does not permit one to reach a conclusion one way or the other on this matter. What is clear, though, is that the possibility exists in teacher-coaches, and the matter still must be settled.

Given this possibility, along with the analysis of the literature pertaining to the constructs of role conflict, organizational commitment, and burnout in teacher-coaches; this project proposes various means of data collection for the above-mentioned constructs. First, a reliable tool, well-known and well-regarded as the “gold standard” in measuring burnout (Schaufeli and Taris, 2005) has been unveiled during the analysis of the existing literature. Furthermore, the
analysis of the literature has also led to the discovery of a specialized version of this tool, designed specifically for measuring the burnout construct in educators. This instrument, Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES), presents an opportunity to gather burnout data among teachers in a direct and straightforward manner. This survey instrument is available online for purchase.

Similarly, reliable tools also exist for measuring the construct of organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model, for example, has been widely used in research to measure one’s “psychological attachment to their organization.” This three-component model measures the commitment of a professional to their organization in three separate domains: affective commitment, one’s psychological attachment to the organization; continuance commitment, one’s “need” to stay in the organization; and normative commitment, one’s inclination to stay with an organization through feelings of obligation.

At the present time, this project proposes the hypothesis of an equal or lower rate of burnout among teacher-coaches due to significant mediation by organizational commitment, but given the contrary attestations of much of the examined literature pertaining to the influence of role conflict on burnout, the hypothesis that teacher-coaches experience higher, not lower rates of burnout relative to non-coaching teachers seems entirely plausible.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which organizational commitment is present within teacher-coaches, and furthermore, to explore the mediating effect it has on the relationship between burnout and being a teacher-coach. This study will use quantitative methods to fulfill its purposes, drawing on survey data to assess the levels of burnout and organizational commitment present within participants, and utilizing multiple regression analysis to deduce the predictive properties of being a teacher-coach on burnout and organizational commitment. This project seeks to answer the following fundamental inquiries:

a. To what extent is being a teacher-coach (as opposed to being a non-coaching teacher) associated with burnout and its three dimensions (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment)?

b. To what extent is being a teacher-coach associated with organizational commitment?

c. To what extent does organizational commitment mediate the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout and its three dimensions?

There is both an empirical and logical basis to the notion that a teacher-coach is at a significantly greater risk of experiencing burnout relative to a teacher. This hypothesis stems from the logical notion that teacher-coaches are exposed to greater amounts of overall stress as a result of the demands of teaching and coaching, and the empirical verity that teacher-coaches specifically have been reported to face inherently greater levels of a specific form of role stress; role conflict (Austell, 2010; Sisley et al., 1987). This heightened exposure to role conflict puts the teacher-coach at a heightened risk of burnout (Figone 1994; Moss, 2015).
Despite this evidence, a study by Richards’ (2014) found no significant difference in burnout between teacher-coaches and teachers. These conclusions suggest that there are still aspects of the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout that have not yet been explored - specifically, the construct of organizational commitment and its possible effects on burnout.

King and Sethi (1997) have provided a basis for the potential of organizational commitment to mitigate burnout in a professional. The conclusions of this particular investigation leave open the possibility that teacher-coaches are shielded, to some extent, from the effects of burnout despite greater exposure to role conflict and burnout if in fact, teacher-coaches do encounter an enhanced level of organizational commitment.

**Design**

The present project proposes the utilization of survey data to answer its primary inquiries. For example, a reliable tool widely known and regarded as the “gold standard” in measuring burnout (Schaufeli and Taris, 2005) has been unveiled during the analysis of the existing literature. Furthermore, the analysis of the literature has also led to the discovery of a specialized version of this tool, designed specifically for measuring the burnout construct in educators. This instrument, Maslach Burnout Inventory-Educators Survey (MBI-ES), presents an opportunity to gather burnout data among teachers in a direct and straightforward manner. This survey instrument is available online for purchase only through its publisher, the company “Mind Garden.” Only sample items of the questionnaire are available free of charge from Mind Garden (appendix A). The full MBI-ES instrument can be purchased at https://www.mindgarden.com/316-mbi-educators-survey

Similarly, reliable and widely known tools exist for measuring the construct of organizational commitment. Meyer and Allen's (1991) three-component model (appendix B), for
example, has been widely used in research to measure one’s “psychological attachment to their organization.” This three-component model measures the commitment of a professional to their organization in three separate domains: affective commitment, one’s psychological attachment to the organization; continuance commitment, one’s “need” to stay in the organization; and normative commitment, one’s inclination to stay with an organization based on feelings of obligation.

Baron and Kenny (1986) along with James and Brett (1984) outlined a four-step process for testing mediation in a relationship:

1. Show the causal variable (teacher-coach status) is correlated with the outcome variable (burnout) so as to show there is an effect that may be mediated.

2. Show that the causal variable (teacher-coach status) is correlated with the mediating variable (organizational commitment) as if the mediator was an outcome variable.

3. Show that the mediator affects the outcome variable.

4. To establish the mediating variable completely mediates the outcome variable, the effect of the causal variable on the outcome variable when controlling for the mediator should be zero.

This project proposes the use of this four-step mediation analysis with organizational commitment serving as a mediating variable between teacher-coach status (predictor variable) and burnout (criterion variable). In essence, mediation analysis details why and how something works, and by utilizing this method, this study will attempt to explain how being a teacher-coach influences organizational commitment, and how organizational commitment, in turn, influences burnout.

Figure 5
Mediation of Teacher-Coach Burnout

Note. Organizational commitment mediates teacher-coach burnout.

Population/Subjects

This project will seek participants (teachers) at the high school level by obtaining permission to seek participation from the District’s Board of Education and Superintendent of Schools. Once permission is granted, individual principals will then be contacted via email. The contact information (email addresses) of building principals from upstate New York (Orange County) will be obtained via an Internet search of the seventeen school districts within the county. Orange County, New York was specifically chosen for this survey because they are a large county in upstate New York with over 57,000 students enrolled in 86 total public schools (16 high schools). Among the 16 high schools in Orange County, there are roughly 431 teacher-coaches. Although the burnout rate has never been studied in Orange County, New York before, the sheer number of school districts and teacher-coaches made this location optimal for gaining a true perspective of how organizational commitment affects teacher-coach burnout.

There are not currently research request procedures within Orange County, New York. Since teachers will be contacted, the information will be gathered, and data results will be
published, common courtesy grants principal and/or athletic director permission from each school within the district. As permission is granted by each high-school principal and/or athletic director to allow the researcher to ask for participation from his/her teachers, the researcher will obtain teacher email addresses via the school's website or information provided by the school’s administration, and the researcher will send an email to qualifying faculty members asking for participation by any interested teachers. The e-mail will explain the aim and parameters of the study, and it will also ask specific questions of the participants, for grouping purposes.

Preliminary survey results will be grouped into teacher-coaches and teachers.

The present project seeks school districts within the Orange County Interscholastic Athletic Association (OCIAA). The OCIAA is located within Section IX of New York State, which is one of the 11 geographical sections in the New York State Public High School Athletic Association (NYSPHSAA). There are 27 public high schools with interscholastic athletic sports programs in Orange County, NY and all of them operate under the jurisdiction of the OCIAA.

It is also important to consider the dynamics of coaching in Orange County, NY. While hiring practices, terms of employment, and contractual expectations may differ depending on each individual school district, the OCIAA and NYSPHSAA require coaches to be certified in several areas including First Aid and CPR, concussion management, child abuse prevention, school violence prevention, coaching-specific courses, fingerprinting, and more. The OCIAA does offer some of the courses and training necessary for coaches to receive certification, but it is incumbent on each individual school district to ensure their coaches are current in their required training and certifications.

Preliminary Survey Items
Preliminary surveys sent to both teacher-coaches and teachers will include the questions below. The individual results and responses from these surveys will truly and accurately separate the participants into their sorting groups accordingly.

The preliminary questions will include:

a. How many years have you been a teacher?

b. Are you male or female?

c. What subject(s) are you currently teaching?

d. What level are you currently teaching (elementary, middle, or high school)?

e. How many years have you been a coach of a school sports team?

f. What sport(s) are you currently coaching?

g. How many years have you been employed at your current school district?

h. Would you estimate you have been a teacher-coach for more or less than 50% of your teaching career?

**Sample Selection**

This project seeks to include roughly 80 participants, 50% teacher-coach and 50% teachers. This should provide adequate power for the study to draw meaningful statistical inferences. The study will seek to actually *include* approximately 80 sets of data responses, which means that if some of the originally selected teachers do not respond to the request for responses, then the researcher may proceed to recruit new participants for the study until about 75 sets of actual responses have been retrieved.

**Instrumentation**

*Maslach Burnout Inventory.* The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) has been recognized for more than a decade as the leading measure of burnout, incorporating the extensive
research that has been conducted in more than 25 years since its initial publication. The MBI instrument includes three questionnaires – the Human Services Survey (MBI-SS), the General Survey (MBI-GS), and the one central to this project, the Educators Survey (MBI-ES). MBI provides more reliability and validity to surveys, especially those that elicit emotionally biased opinions.

All MBI surveys assess three psychometric dimensions:

I. **Emotional exhaustion** measures feelings of being emotionally overextended and exhausted by one’s work

II. **Depersonalization** measures an unfeeling and impersonal response toward recipients of one’s service, care treatment, or instruction

III. **Personal accomplishment** measures feelings of competence and successful achievement in one’s work

MBI-ES evaluates three specific dimensions of burnout in professionals in education - including administrators, teachers, and teacher aides. This tool is exceedingly similar to the MBI-SS, despite that, it is designed to uniquely assess administrative stress in relation to students. The MBI-ES is a 22-item survey utilizing a 7-point scale for respondents to answer each item. In answering survey-items, the responders’ options range from “never” to “every day.”

**Organizational Commitment.** The three-component model of commitment developed by Meyer and Allen (1997) arguably dominates organizational commitment research (Meyer et al., 2002). This model proposes that organizational commitment is experienced by the employee as three simultaneous mindsets encompassing affective, normative, and continuance organizational commitment. Affective Commitment reflects commitment based on emotional ties the employee develops with the organization primarily via positive work experiences. Normative Commitment
reflects commitment based on perceived obligation towards the organization, for example, rooted in the norms of reciprocity. Continuance Commitment reflects commitment based on the perceived costs, both economic and social, of leaving the organization. This model of commitment has been used by researchers to predict important employee outcomes, including turnover and citizenship behaviors, job performance, absenteeism, and tardiness (Meyer et al., 2002). Meyer and Allen (1997) provide a comprehensive overview of the theoretical lineage of this model.

There are two versions of the TCM Employee Commitment Survey – original and revised (see below). Both include statements (items) pertaining to employees’ perception of their relationship with the organization and their reasons for staying. After reading each item, employees indicate the strength of their agreement by selecting a number from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). In the original version of the survey, there are eight items for each of the three commitment scales: ACS, NCS, and CCS. In the revised survey there are six statements for each scale. Similar to the MBI, this survey allows for more reliability and validity to the survey by giving emotions and opinions a quantitative value. (Note: A new version of the CCS has recently been developed based on accumulating evidence that the original scale reflects two underlying dimensions, personal sacrifice and lack of alternatives (see Allen & Meyer, 1996) and that the personal sacrifice dimension corresponds more closely to the continuance commitment construct as it was originally conceived (see Allen & Meyer, 1996; McGee & Ford, 1987; Meyer et al., 2002). For both the original and revised versions of the survey, the items in Appendix B are grouped according to scale: ACS, NCS, and CCS. For purposes of survey administration, the items from the three scales are mixed. For scoring purposes, employees’ responses to all of the items within a scale are averaged to yield an overall score for each of the
three components of commitment (see below for more detail). Although it is also possible to sum the item scores rather than average, this could potentially create a problem if employees fail to respond to items. Missing data will have a much greater impact on total scores than on average scores. Of course, if employees fail to respond to a large number of items (e.g., more than two or three per scale), their scores should not be interpreted as the absence of data can be problematic for the analysis and interpretation of an employee survey (McDonald, Thurston, and Nelson (2000); Roth, Switzer, and Switzer (1999). Some of the items in the commitment scales have been worded such that strong agreement actually reflects a lower level of commitment. These are referred to as “reverse-keyed” items (identified by “R” after the statement) and are included to encourage respondents to think about each statement carefully rather than mindlessly adopting a pattern of agreeing or disagreeing with the statements. For the same reason, it is recommended that items from the three commitment scales be integrated for purposes of presentation in a paper or web-based survey. For scoring purposes, however, it is important that (a) scores on reverse-keyed statements be re-coded (i.e., 1 = 7, 2 = 6, … 7 = 1) before scoring, and (b) averages are computed based only on items relevant to the specific scale. Scores computed by combining items from the different commitment scales will not be meaningful. If scored correctly, three scores should be obtained, one each for the ACS, NCS, and CCS, for each respondent. These scores should range in value from 1 to 7 with higher scores indicating stronger commitment.

Reliability and Validity

The concepts of reliability and validity essentially pertain to the question of how much error exists in a study. Validity is concerned with answering the question “Is the data representative of the processor system under scrutiny?” (Kiemele, Schmidt, & Berdine, 2000) whereas reliability is focused on the replication of similar results.
There are four different kinds of statistical validities that are relevant to research and experimentation; statistical conclusion validity, internal validity, construct validity, and external validity (Maxwell & Delaney, 2004). Each of these is important in order for the experiment to give accurate predictions and draw valid conclusions. Statistical conclusion validity refers to the researcher’s analysis to make the correct decision regarding the truth of the null hypothesis. Statistical conclusion validity involves the researcher’s decision regarding whether or not variables are related to one another. Internal validity is concerned with the relationships between variables and whether or not they represent what has been theoretically inferred. Construct validity alludes to the assumed relationship between the variables.

To minimize the threat to construct validity, multiple questions were used for each job satisfaction and organizational commitment variables. Additionally, the survey contained varied wording and reverse keying to minimize anticipating the desired response. External validity refers to the ability to apply the research to other populations. Although the geographic and economic conditions may play a part in the results of the analysis, the survey questions have been used in previous studies, therefore external validity is not an issue with this analysis. In this study statistical methods were used to measure the validity of the sample size to confirm the survey sample was representative of a 95% confidence level.

The MBI consists of 22 items that are divided into three subscales (Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization, and Personal Accomplishment) that reflect different aspects of the burnout syndrome. Each item is rated on both an intensity and a frequency dimension. Scores on each subscale appear to be reliable (Russell et al., 1987). Maslach and Jackson (1981) reported alpha coefficients ranging from .71 to .90 for the three subscales. Supporting the validity of the measure, burnout scores have been found to increase in stressful job settings and
to predict job turnover and absenteeism (Maslach, 1982). Previous research has indicated that the intensity and frequency ratings are highly correlated (see Constable & Russell, 1986; Iwanicki & Schwab, 1981; Maslach & Jackson, 1981).

Gold (1984) has also conducted several investigations into the reliability and validity of the MBI instrument. Their conclusions support reliability such as the three-factor structure and internal reliability. Schwab reported Cronbach’s alpha ratings of 0.90 for emotional exhaustion, 0.76 depersonalization, and 0.76 for personal accomplishment; very similar to the ratings reported by Gold. Time periods of 3-weeks, 3 months, and 1 year were used to determine test-retest reliability. The 3-week range yielded the highest scores (.60-.82), whereas scores in the 1-year range were the lowest (0.54-0.60). The test manual covers validity for the MBI by noting patterns that appear again in the field. For example, male teachers score higher than female teachers in the depersonalization scale, which is consistent with other professions involving work with other people.

Furthermore, it seems differences appear in the phenomenology of burnout across cultures. Denton (2013), for example, noted this difference while studying burnout in two separate teacher cohorts in New York City and Jamaica. Denton concluded teachers in NYC tended to “assess feelings of burnout by emotional exhaustion and define burnout among colleagues in terms of emotional exhaustion.” In contrast, teachers in Jamaica “did not experience feelings of emotional exhaustion as a basis for burnout, but increasingly defined burnout in terms of a lack of personal accomplishment.” This is an important issue to consider as understanding the psychometric properties of burnout through a mixed-method approach can complement a quantitative study.
The Meyer and Allen OCS instrument used in this survey has been used in numerous research studies (see Jenkins, 2008; Somers, 1995; Fu, Bolander, & Jones, 2009; and Meyer and Allen, 1997). However, according to Meyer and Allen (1997), the reliability of the OCS instrument is too low for employees working for an organization for less than one year. Therefore, the responses from teachers working for less than one year within the participating school will not be used in the analysis. Additionally, the OCS instrument has been used in many past surveys and the coefficient alphas ranged from 0.77 to 0.88 for the affective, 0.65 to 0.86 for normative, and 0.69 to 0.84 for continuance commitment (Fields, 2002). An alpha above .7 is considered sufficient to ensure reliability.

Data Collection

The data for this project will be retrieved by administering the survey tools identified above regarding burnout and organizational commitment to the selected subjects of the study. Once the subjects have been identified, administering online surveys should be a fairly straightforward process that can be done by the researcher alone. The researcher will offer the online surveys to each participant with a request that they are completed within two weeks. The researcher will offer each participant an incentive for completing the surveys within the allotted two-week time period.

Each of the responses will be coded in terms of whether it is coming from a teacher-coach or a teacher, although the data will also be de-identified such that the identities of the subjects will be unknown. The data from the surveys will consist of the sole source of data for the project. Given the nature of the tools at hand, the study will utilize a quantitative design. For the specific collection of data from individual surveys, quantitative data will be analyzed. Once
all of the data has been received, qualitative data can be concluded from the total teacher-coach and teacher data.

**Human Subjects Protection**

*Confidentiality*. To safeguard privacy, the raw data will only be examined by the researcher and all collected data will be electronically stored on a USB memory key and will be kept in a locked, secure location and stored for a period of at least 3 years.

*Internal Review Board*. Research is defined as a systematic investigation, including research development, testing, and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. A project requires IRB review if it includes both research and human subjects. The present project will seek approval for the involvement of human subjects to fulfill its research purposes.

**Data Analysis**

The present project will utilize multiple regression analysis in order to produce meaningful findings out of the raw data obtained from the participants in the study. Since regression analysis is a commonly used statistical process for estimating the relationships among variables, it will be used in order to determine relationships between the status of being a teacher-coach (independent variable or "predictor" variable) and the constructs of organizational commitment and burnout (dependent variables). To take things one step further, due to the multivariate nature of this study, this project proposes the use of multivariate multiple regression (MMR) as the method of choice for analyzing the collected data. MMR affords the researcher a reliable way to model the dependent variables of burnout and organizational commitment, with a single variable present (being a teacher-coach). In other words, this project seeks to model the constructs of burnout and organizational commitment as functions of being a teacher-coach. This
would allow the researcher to evaluate the relationship that being a teacher-coach has with each of the three dependent constructs.

More specifically, organizational commitment is conceptualized as a mediator between the independent variable of teacher-coach status and the dependent variable of burnout. This logically follows from the fact that the literature strongly suggests organizational commitment to be a component construct of burnout. That is, within the concept of burnout itself, organizational commitment is the predictor that produces the dependent variable of burnout. The present study adds another link to this chain by considering teacher-coach status as the original predictor that affects organizational commitment and thus burnout. The main hypothesis here is that teacher-coach status will increase levels of organizational commitment and organizational commitment will have a moderating effect on burnout (i.e. the teacher-coach is protected from burnout through a pathway of enhanced organizational commitment). This study will answer its fundamental inquiries with the following regression analyses while controlling for length of time as a teacher-coach:

1. To what extent is being a teacher-coach (independent variable) associated with each of the three dimensions of burnout (dependent variables - emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment)?

   a. To what extent does teacher-coach status (independent variable) predict emotional exhaustion (dependent variable)?

   b. To what extent does teacher-coach status (independent variable) predict depersonalization (dependent variable)?

   c. To what extent does teacher-coach status (independent variable) predict personal accomplishment (dependent variable)?
2. To what extent is being a teacher-coach (independent variable) associated with *each* of the three dimensions of organizational commitment (dependent variables - affective, continuance, and normative)?
   a. To what extent does teacher-coach status (independent variable) predict affective commitment (dependent variable)?
   b. To what extent does teacher-coach status (independent variable) predict continuance commitment (dependent variable)?
   c. To what extent does teacher-coach status (dependent variable) predict normative commitment (dependent variable)?

3. To what extent does organizational commitment (mediator variable) mediate the relationship between being a teacher-coach (independent variable) and each of the three dimensions of burnout (dependent variables)?
   a. To what extent does affective commitment (independent variable) predict emotional exhaustion (dependent variable 1), depersonalization (dependent variable 2), and personal accomplishment (dependent variable 3)?
   b. To what extent does continuance commitment (independent variable) predict emotional exhaustion (dependent variable 1), depersonalization (dependent variable 2), and personal accomplishment (dependent variable 3)?
   c. To what extent does normative commitment (independent variable) predict emotional exhaustion (dependent variable 1), depersonalization (dependent variable 2), and personal accomplishment (dependent variable 3)?
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Review of Data Collection

The project independently measured two relationships of the teacher-coach: their relationship with burnout and with organizational commitment. Descriptive statistics were utilized in testing the sample and various subscales of burnout and organizational commitment. The project utilized inferential statistics in testing its hypotheses, and these inferential statistics included regression analysis to calculate the degree to which certain, chiefly teacher-coach status, independent variables were predictive of burnout and organizational commitment.

Survey instruments were used to collect pertinent data. Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educators Survey (MBI-ES) and Meyer and Allan’s Revised Three-Component Organizational Commitment Survey (1993) were sent to 8 Orange County Interscholastic Athletic Association (OCIAA) Athletic Directors via email. The Athletic Directors then forwarded the surveys to 248 teachers and coaches. Participants were given four weeks to respond to survey items between the dates of November 25th and December 21, 2019. The email also contained a link, created through Qualtrics, that directed participants to both questionnaires. Before being directed to the questionnaires, participants were prompted to the following questions. Responses to these background questions were used for grouping purposes:

a. How many years have you been a teacher?

b. Are you male or female?

c. What subject(s) are you currently teaching?

d. What level are you currently teaching (elementary, middle, or high school)?

e. How many years have you been a coach of a school sports team?

f. What sport(s) are you currently coaching?
Research Questions

The project sought answers to three distinct inquiries. The first explored the relationship between being a teacher-coach and the three dimensions of burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment). The second explored the relationship between being a teacher-coach and the three dimensions of organizational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative). The third centered on the mediating impact of organizational commitment on the relationship between burnout and teacher-coaches. These lines of inquiry guided the project through its various phases:

a. To what extent is being a teacher-coach (as opposed to being a non-coaching teacher) associated with burnout and its three dimensions (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment)?

b. To what extent is being a teacher-coach associated with organizational commitment and its three dimensions (normative, affective and continuance commitment)?

c. To what extent does organizational commitment mediate the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout and its three dimensions?

The project assessed burnout and organizational commitment in its participants through the utilization of the Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educator Survey (MBI-ES) instrument and the Revised Three-Component Commitment Scale of Meyer et al. (1993), respectively. The investigation of potential mediation of burnout in teacher-coaches by organizational commitment was performed pursuant to Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation analysis framework.
Descriptive Statistics

The data analysis included descriptive statistics. In total, the teaching experience of participants ranged from 1 year to 30 years with an average of 12.25 years. Teachers in the sample reported a range of academic backgrounds, with the highest percentage comprising Health & Physical Education teachers (25.4%) and the lowest percentage comprising Social Studies (17.5%) and teachers of other areas like Special Education, Technology and Art (17.5%).

Table 1

*Years of Teaching Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>7.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Subjects Taught*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language (English, French and Spanish)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Physical Education</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Sp. Ed., Technology and Art)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, the study used data from 63 participants for a response rate of 25.4%. Of the 63 respondents, 36 were male (N=36), 26 were female (N=26) and 1 participant elected not to specify. Thus, males comprised 57% of the sample while females comprised 42.3%.

Furthermore, a 2:1 ratio of teacher-coach participants (N=42) to teacher participants (N=21) was observed in the sample. Nearly three-quarters of respondents were high school teachers (74.6%) while 16 participants (25.3%) were teachers at the elementary or middle-school level.

Table 3

*Participant Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

*Teaching Level*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/Middle</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As teacher participants reported a varied array of academic backgrounds, teacher-coach respondents reported a similar variety of sport backgrounds. The largest percentage of teacher-coaches (35.7%) consisted of basketball coaches, while the lowest percentage (8%) of teacher-coaches consisted of wrestling coaches. Nine percent of the total teacher-coach sample was coaches of cheerleading, swimming, and bowling. Time spent coaching ranged from 1 year of experience to 24 years of experience. The average coaching experience was 5.3 years.

Table 5

*Sports Coached*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Track</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrestling</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Cheer, Swimming, Bowling)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean Response Scores**

The 22-item MBI-ES instrument assesses three distinct burnout subscales - emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment. On average, teacher-coaches responded lowest to the third item of the MBI-ES instrument. This item reads, “I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.” This statement is one of nine items intended to assess the level of emotional exhaustion that exists within a school professional. The average response score for the teacher-coach group on this particular item was
3.79. This score would indicate that, on average, a few times per month, teacher-coaches in this sample felt fatigued when faced with another day on the job.

Conversely, teacher-coaches responded highest to the last item, item 22 of the MBI instrument. This item reads, “I feel students blame me for their problems.” Unlike item 3, this item is one of 5 items designed to assess one’s level of depersonalization or negative attitudes towards the people they work with. The mean score of the teacher-coach group for this particular item was 4.98, and this implied the teacher-coaches in the sample felt negatively about their students at least a few times per week and thus, were experiencing a high level of depersonalization.

*See Appendix C for teacher-coach mean burnout response scores.*

Mean response scores from the MBI-ES were also calculated for the teacher group. Teacher responses were lowest on average in item 19 of the instrument with a score of 3.67. This item references a feeling of “accomplishing many worthwhile things” at work, a statement designed to appraise a professional’s feelings of personal accomplishment. Having reported an average score of 3.67 on this particular item would signify the teachers in the group felt they had accomplished something worthwhile at work just a few times per month (Maslach, 1986). While teacher participants indicated feeling accomplished at work only occasionally, item 16 of the survey indicated teachers felt stress much more frequently. Item 16 of the MBI-ES is a statement designed to assess the level of stress a person experiences when working directly with others. The sixteenth item, coincidentally, like the third item discussed above, is also an item designed to measure emotional exhaustion. Teachers, on average, scored a 4.71 on this item, indicating they feel stress a few times per week when working directly with people.

*See Appendix D for teacher mean burnout response scores.*
All 63 participants completed the Revised Organizational Commitment Survey (OCS) developed by Meyer and Allen (1991) in addition to the MBI-ES. The OCS questionnaire was designed to assess one’s degree of commitment to their organization. Similar to the burnout construct, the construct of organizational commitment is broken down into three individual subscales; affective commitment, normative commitment, and continuance commitment. Mean response scores in these subscales were calculated according to the OCS data for both groups.

Teacher-coaches responded highest, on average, to the first-item of the OCS instrument relative to the other seventeen items contained in the questionnaire. This statement is designed to assess one’s feelings of affective commitment, or loyalty, toward an organization. It reads, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.” Teacher-coaches reported a high mean score of 5.05 on this item, indicating the teacher-coaches generally identified with feelings of wanting to stay with their organization (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Moreover, the group’s lowest mean response score seemingly corroborates this feeling of loyalty and wanting to remain. The group’s lowest mean score (3.60) was observed on item 3 of the OCS instrument - a statement that also gauges feelings of affective commitment. The statement reads, “I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.” A low mean score of 3.60 on this item indicates that teacher-coaches generally felt a sense of belonging to their organization. It is important to note that this item was one of four total items on the OCS instrument that required reverse-coding (Meyer and Allen, 1991).

*See Appendix E for teacher-coach means responses on the OCS instrument.*

While teacher-coaches seemed to have a strong affinity for remaining with their organization, mean response scores for the teacher group indicated the opposite inclination. A high mean score of 4.76 was observed in the teacher group for the fifth-item of the OCS
instrument, another statement intended to measure affective commitment. The statement reads, “I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.” The intended purpose of this statement is to quantify a person’s feelings of affective commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991), and while this statement is only one out of six total statements contained in the survey that assesses affective commitment, the group’s mean response score of 4.76 implies each teacher, on average, did not feel a close association with the organization.

The teachers’ low mean response score stipulates a parallel notion—that not only did this group not feel like part of the family, so to speak, they also did not possess strong feelings of obligation to the people they work with. This was observed in the seventeenth-item of the instrument, a statement intended to measure feelings of normative commitment, or feelings of obligation to stay with an organization, by prompting the participants to estimate feelings of obligation toward people in an organization. The calculated mean response score of 3.76 indicates teachers generally did not identify with feelings of obligation to the people in an organization. This unveiling seems logical, as a professional who does not feel like “part of the family” would likely not possess enough meaningful relationships to cause them to want to stay with an organization.

*See Appendix F for mean teacher response scores on the OCS instrument.*

**Burnout**

Both groups reported similar experiences with respect to emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Mean scores indicated both groups experienced high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Teacher-coaches (N=42) reported an average score of 30.06 in the area of emotional exhaustion while teachers (N = 21) reported a slightly higher average of 30.23; both of which are high (Maslach, 1986). In terms of the depersonalization subscale, the
calculated mean (16.91) for the teacher-coach group was slightly higher relative to the teacher mean score (16.61). Both groups’ mean scores are also considered high in the depersonalization domain (Maslach, 1986).

While both groups expressed high fatigue, emotional overextension, and cynicism, the biggest difference seemed to exist in the area of personal accomplishment. Personal accomplishment refers to feelings of value in work, and it was in this area the teacher-coach showed a dissimilar result. Teachers reported a low level of accomplishment with a mean score (30.44) relative to the teacher-coach group (Maslach, 1986). Teacher-coaches reported a moderate level of personal accomplishment with a mean score of 32.89.
Table 6

*Burnout Means x Coaching Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Status</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mean 30.23</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 3.532</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mean 30.06</td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>32.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 3.280</td>
<td>3.683</td>
<td>3.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean 30.12</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>32.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 3.338</td>
<td>3.096</td>
<td>3.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both teachers and teacher-coaches indicated high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. High emotional exhaustion and depersonalization were also seen in males and females. Female participants reported similar mean scores in all three burnout subscales relative to males. Females scored higher than males solely in the emotional exhaustion subscale. Much like the teacher-coach group revealed high emotional exhaustion, high depersonalization and moderate personal accomplishment, mean burnout scores by gender indicate both males and females revealed the same outcomes - high exhaustion, high depersonalization and a moderate sense of accomplishment.
Table 7

*Burnout Means x Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>29.95</td>
<td>16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.486</td>
<td>2.549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.35</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.245</td>
<td>3.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>16.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>3.366</td>
<td>3.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample was also sorted according to teaching level. For the purposes of this comparison, teachers were delineated into one of two levels - elementary/middle school or high school. The comparison of the two groups indicated elementary/middle-school teachers were seemingly less emotionally exhausted and less personally accomplished than those teaching at the high school level. Elementary and middle-school teachers revealed an average of 29.56 and 30.31 in the emotional exhaustion and personal accomplishment subscales, respectively. The mean score for emotional exhaustion was high while the personal accomplishment mean score was low. High school teachers revealed a larger, more moderate mean personal accomplishment score (32.15). Ultimately, teachers of both levels revealed high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. It was solely the high school group, however, that disclosed a moderate
level of personal accomplishment. The elementary/middle school teachers reported a low level of personal accomplishment.

Table 8

_Burnout Means x Teaching Level_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Emotional Exhaustion</th>
<th>Depersonalization</th>
<th>Personal Accomplishment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary/ Middle School</strong></td>
<td>Mean 29.56</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>31.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 2.968</td>
<td>2.220</td>
<td>3.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td>Mean 30.31</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>32.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 3.465</td>
<td>3.348</td>
<td>2.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Mean 30.12</td>
<td>16.81</td>
<td>32.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 3.338</td>
<td>3.096</td>
<td>3.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Organizational Commitment_

Mean scores for each organizational commitment subscale were calculated. When comparing teachers and teacher-coaches, teacher-coaches revealed larger mean scores in the areas of affective and normative commitment. Teachers scored higher in the area of continuance commitment relative to the teacher-coach group. The teacher mean score of 26 indicates the group felt a stronger sense of continuance commitment rather than affective or normative commitment. This suggests teachers were remaining with their organizations more so due to feelings of need rather than feelings of loyalty and obligation, on the one hand, while teacher-coaches on the other hand, with a high mean score of 26.02 in the normative scale, were
remaining with the organization more so through feelings of obligation rather than loyalty or feeling the need to stay.

Table 9

*Mean Commitment Scores x Coaching Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Status</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Mean</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.217</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td>1.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Mean</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>26.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td>4.803</td>
<td>2.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>25.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.329</td>
<td>4.193</td>
<td>2.341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced by a mean score of 26.04, female participants seemed to identify more so with normative commitment than affective (25) or continuance commitment (24). Male participants scored highest on average in the area of normative commitment (25.25) compared to the affective (24.75) and continuance commitment (24.39) subscales. These mean scores indicate males and females shared a similar experience with respect to organizational commitment, and that is both groups experienced feelings of obligation above feelings of loyalty and need.

Table 10
### Mean Commitment Scores x Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>24.39</td>
<td>25.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 2.419</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>2.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>26.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 2.245</td>
<td>4.205</td>
<td>2.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>24.23</td>
<td>25.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation 2.332</td>
<td>4.221</td>
<td>2.214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing participants by teaching level, elementary/middle school teachers possessed a higher mean score in two of the three commitment scales relative to high school teachers. Those scales were affective commitment (24.94) and normative commitment (26). A higher mean score for high school teachers (24.64) was seen in the continuance commitment scale relative to teachers at the elementary/middle school level (23.13). The mean scores in each commitment scale reveal similar feelings of work-related loyalty and obligation within the two groups, but a higher sense of “needing to stay” within the high school teacher group.

Table 11

### Organizational Commitment Means x Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Continuance</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Alpha Coefficients

To determine the inter-reliability of items in each subscale, Cronbach’s alpha was run to ensure internal consistency and reliability. Cronbach’s alpha is a statistical analysis that determines the degree to which all items within a scale measure the same construct (Cronk, 2014). Essentially, Cronbach’s alpha reliability is the average correlation between items, and its purpose is to measure the consistency of responses between the various subscales. Each burnout subscale was found to be of acceptable reliability and consistency as the following alpha coefficients were calculated for each: emotional exhaustion (.713), depersonalization (.759), personal accomplishment (.730). Alpha coefficients were also calculated for each organizational commitment subscale. The affective, continuance and normative subscales were all found to be of acceptable reliability: affective commitment scale (.771), continuance commitment scale (.723), normative commitment scale (.777).

### Analysis and Findings

**Question 1**
The present project sought answers to three distinct research questions. The first research question called for an exploration of the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout. To determine the extent of this relationship, multiple regression analysis was utilized. Additional independent variables were included as potential predictors of burnout. Those independent variables included years of teaching experience, gender, and teaching level.

Multiple regression analysis revealed the independent variables of teacher-coach status, years of teaching experience, teaching level, and gender were all non-predictors of emotional exhaustion. This model possessed an R-square value of .024. The R-square value indicates this regression model could explain just 2.4% of the variance between variables. It is worth turning attention to the adjusted R-square value as this model tested multiple predictors. The negative adjusted r-square value of -.045 suggests a negligible and insignificant effect of the predictor variables on the dependent variable of emotional exhaustion. The adjusted r-square value of -.045 indicates a 4.5% shared variance, or covariance, between the variables. This value suggests this particular regression model is relatively weak as the closer the r-square value is to 1 or -1, the stronger the model. The (-) in this adjusted r-square value indicates an inverse or indirect relationship between variables.

Table 12

*Regression Model Summary, Emotional Exhaustion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>3.469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Predictors: (Constant), Teaching Level, Years Teaching, Gender, TC Status*

The coefficient table below illustrates the dependent variables included in the analysis along with the unstandardized (B) and standardized beta-coefficients, standard error, t-statistic, and significance value (p-value) for each variable. It is worth turning brief attention to these key
items as an understanding of the items in the coefficient table will better inform an understanding of the analysis and conclusions of this project.

First, the unstandardized beta (B) value represents the rise or fall for every one unit of increase to the independent variable. Essentially, the B-value represents the slope of the line or the rate of change between the predictor variable and the dependent variable. The standard error value, also known as the standard error of the estimate, is the standard error for the unstandardized beta (B). This statistic is similar in nature to the standard deviation value given when comparing means. The standard error signifies how far apart data points are from the regression line, or how inaccurate the model is on average. Smaller standard error values are accepted as more accurate as a smaller value signifies data points that are closer to the regression line. Next is the standardized beta-coefficient. This number essentially represents the strength of the relationship between the predictor variable and the dependent variable with the strongest of relationships existing at 1 or -1. A negative beta-coefficient would represent an inverse or indirect relationship between the two variables. The t-value, or t-statistic as it is commonly referred to, measures the size of the difference in units of standard error. Essentially, the t-statistic represents the units of standard error the coefficient is away from zero. Lastly, the significance value, or (p) value represents the predictive significance of the independent variable on the dependent variable. P-values below .05 are accepted as statistically significant and not occurring by chance.

The first regression model shows the predictor variables of teaching experience (years), gender, teacher-coach status, and teaching level to have weak standardized beta-coefficients (-.110 and below). The unstandardized-beta values show the teaching level to have the strongest rate of change (.709) on the dependent variable of emotional exhaustion. The standard error for
the variable of teaching level was 1.056. The standardized-beta for this relationship was .093 and the t-statistic was .672. Furthermore, this relationship along with all other relationships tested in the model was shown to be insignificant as the p-value for each is greater than .05. This model indicates the dependent variables of teaching experience, gender, teacher-coach status and teaching level to all be non-predictors of emotional exhaustion.

Table 13

Regression Coefficients, Emotional Exhaustion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>30.067</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>20.921</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC Status</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Emotional Exhaustion

A regression analysis was then run to determine the predictive properties of the same four independent variables on depersonalization. The adjusted r-square value was -.041%. This value is indicative of just a 4.1% shared variance between the independent and dependent variables. The negative (-) value indicates an inverse relationship among variables. The standard error was calculated at 3.198.

The coefficient table illustrates much the same result as in the previous analysis of emotional exhaustion. Each of the four predictor variables tested are weak predictors of
depersonalization with low standardized beta-coefficients. The standardized coefficients of -.133, -.036, .022 and -.076 indicated three of the four relationships were inverse, or indirect - as the only variable to share a direct relationship with depersonalization was that of teacher-coach status. The variable of years teaching had the lowest standard error (.053) while the standard error for each of the other three variables was well-above .8. In terms of statistical significance or p-value, the regression analysis showed all four independent variables to be non-predictors of depersonalization, much like each proved to be non-predictors of emotional exhaustion in the previous regression analysis.

Table 14

Regression Model Summary, Depersonalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>3.198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Predictors: (Constant), Teaching Level, Years Teaching, Gender, TC Status

Table 15

Regression Coefficients, Depersonalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>17.872</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC Status</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td>-.539</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dependent Variable: Depersonalization
An analysis of personal accomplishment and its relationship to the variables of teaching level, teaching years, teacher-coach status, and gender yielded dissimilar results relative to the previous two analyses of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. The adjusted R-square value in the model was .201, signaling a direct relationship between the variables and a shared variance of 20.1% among them. The standard error was calculated at 2.812.

The analysis identified standardized coefficients of -.258 for years teaching, -.078 for gender, .424 for teacher-coach status, and .181 for teaching level. In terms of statistical significance, the calculated p-values indicated the variables of years teaching (.031) and teacher-coach status (.001) to be predictive of personal accomplishment while gender (.513) and teaching level (.139) not to be. This finding is contrary to the findings of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, as no statistically significant relationships were found. The t-statistic for years teaching and teacher-coach status were acceptable at -2.211 and 3.469, respectively. It is important to note the unstandardized and standardized beta coefficients of -.102 and -.258 as this signifies an inverse relationship between years of teaching experience and personal accomplishment.

Table 16

*Regression Model Summary, Personal Accomplishment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>2.812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level, Years, Gender, TC Status

Table 17

*Regression Coefficients, Personal Accomplishment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first analysis included the predictor variables of teaching level, years teaching, gender, and teacher-coach status. Each variable was tested to affective commitment as the dependent variable. The adjusted R-square value of .205 indicated a direct relationship between the variables. The adjusted R-square value signifies 20.5% of the shared variance or covariance between the variables. The standard error of the model was 2.092.

The analysis delineated no statistical significance in the relationship between three of the four independent variables and affective commitment. The analysis did indicate, however, a statistically significant relationship (p = .000) between teacher-coach status and affective commitment. A standardized beta-coefficient of .530 indicates a direct relationship between being a teacher-coach and elevated levels of affective commitment. The standard error for this
The relationship was .597, the standardized beta coefficient was 2.596, and the t-statistic was 4.347. The model illustrates the predictive nature of teacher-coach status on affective commitment or feeling loyalty towards an organization.

Table 18

**Regression Model Summary, Affective Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>2.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level, Years, Gender, TC Status

Table 19

**Regression Coefficients, Affective Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.313</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>25.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC Status</td>
<td>2.596</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Affective Commitment

The next regression model was centered on the continuance commitment subscale as the dependent variable. This analysis used the same predictor variables used in the previous models. Those variables were years of teaching, gender, teacher-coach status, and teaching level. The model indicates an adjusted R-squared value of .064, or 6.4% covariance among variables.

The coefficient table highlights the unstandardized beta-coefficients of .091 (years teaching), -.302 (gender), -2.319 (teacher-coach status), and .790 (teaching level). Teacher-coach
status possessed the largest standardized beta-coefficient as well (-.261). This relationship was shown to have no statistical significance as the given p-value was greater than .05. The model disproved any significant relationships between years teaching, gender, teacher-coach status or teaching level and continuance commitment.

Table 20

**Regression Model Summary, Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>4.117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level, Years, Gender, TC Status

Table 21

**Regression Coefficients, Continuance Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>24.165</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>14.168 .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.302</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>-.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC Status</td>
<td>-2.319</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>-.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Continuance Commitment

Lastly, as for the second research question of the project, a third and final regression analysis aimed to examine the relationship of each of the four independent variables to the third and final subscale of organizational commitment - normative commitment. The model summary showed an r-squared value of .085 and an adjusted r-square value of .020. The adjusted value
indicates a 2% covariance among variables in the equation. The standard error was calculated at 2.21.

P-values indicate no statistically significant relationships between any of the four variables and normative commitment. T-values ranged from 1.412 (gender) to -1.066 (years teaching). The standardized beta-coefficients show gender to have the strongest effect on normative commitment (.185) relative to the other variables. Gender also showed the strongest rate of change on normative commitment with a .826 unstandardized beta-coefficient. In essence, gender, years of teaching experience, teacher-coach status, and teaching level were shown not to influence normative commitment.

Table 22

Regression Model Summary, Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>2.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Level, Years, Gender, TC Status

Table 23

Regression Coefficients, Normative Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>25.646</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>28.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC Status</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td>-.444</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Normative Commitment
**Question 3**

The third and final question of this project sought answers to the impact that organizational commitment had on the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout. To explore this plausibility, this project utilized the framework of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation analysis. This framework, in terms of the present project, requires the following four-steps:

1. To show the causal variable (teacher-coach status) is correlated with the outcome variable (burnout) so as to show there is an effect that may be mediated.
2. To show the causal variable (teacher-coach status) is correlated with the mediating variable (organizational commitment) as if the mediator was an outcome variable.
3. Show the mediator affects the outcome variable.
4. To establish the mediating variable completely mediates the outcome variable, the effect of the causal variable on the outcome variable when controlling for the mediator should be zero.

The previous subsections of the chapter detail the connection between teacher-coach status and burnout (step 1) as well as the connection between teacher-coach status and organizational commitment (step 2). In those subsections, it was shown that teacher-coach status was, in fact, predictive of both personal accomplishment and affective commitment. In addition, it was uncovered that years of teaching experience was also predictive of personal accomplishment in an indirect manner.

As the first two steps in the Baron and Kenny (1986) framework have been established, satisfying the third step of the process required an additional regression equation to be run. In
this equation, the independent variables of affective, continuance, and normative commitment were tested alongside the variables of gender, teaching experience, and teaching level. These six predictor variables were tested independently to each burnout subscale (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment) independently.

First, the model tested all six predictor variables to the dependent variable of emotional exhaustion. The adjusted r-square value for the model was -.052, and the standard error for the model was 3.480. Each variable possessed a standard beta-coefficient under .2. The newly added variables of organizational commitment - affective, continuance and normative - had standardized beta values of .162, .103, and -.140, respectively. Normative commitment had the highest standard of error among the three newly added commitment variables with a standard error of .215. T-values for the commitment variables ranged from -.650 (normative) to .941 (affective). Furthermore, all relationships showed no statistical significance. Thus, organizational commitment was found not to affect emotional exhaustion.

Table 24

**Mediation Model Summary, Emotional Exhaustion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Years, Gender, Level, Affective, Continuance, Normative

Table 25

**Mediation Coefficients, Emotional Exhaustion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>27.355</td>
<td>6.939</td>
<td>3.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the continued mediation analysis, similar results were seen for depersonalization as in the analysis of emotional exhaustion. There existed no significant relationships between any of the mediator variables and depersonalization as p-values were all above .05. The adjusted r-square value indicates 5.8% of the shared variance among variables. The standardized beta coefficients ranged from -0.173 (years teaching) to 0.076 (continuance commitment). The unstandardized beta coefficients among variables indicated teaching level to have the strongest rate of change among all six variables (-0.776). Standard error coefficients ranged from 0.055 (years teaching) to 0.962 (teaching level). T-values ranged -1.248 (years teaching) to 0.548 (continuance commitment).

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>3.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Years, Gender, Level, Affective, Continuance, Normative

Table 27

Mediation Coefficients, Depersonalization
Next, a regression analysis was conducted to determine the impact of the same six independent variables on the third and final subscale of burnout - personal accomplishment. It is worth noting, as discussed previously in this chapter, teacher-coach status and number of years teaching were both found to be significant predictors of personal accomplishment. The model shows an adjusted $r$-square value of -.058. This indicates an inverse relationship among variables with a 5.8% covariance among variables. Standard error of the estimate was 3.224. Unlike in previous models, the model showed two of the six variables (years teaching and affective commitment) to be significant predictors of personal accomplishment.

Years teaching refers to an educator’s length of career in years teaching. For this variable, a standard error of .05 was calculated along with a standardized beta-value of -.292 and an unstandardized value of -.115. These values indicate an inverse relationship between years of teaching experience and personal accomplishment. In other words, as the number of years of teaching experience goes up, personal accomplishment tends to decrease. The p-value for this relationship was significant at .024. The relationship shows an acceptable t-value of -2.321.
The model indicates affective commitment also to be a significant predictor of personal accomplishment. Affective commitment refers to a professional’s sense of loyalty for an organization and their propensity to want to remain with the organization. Affective commitment showed a standardized beta-coefficient of .328 and an unstandardized value of .440. These values represent a direct relationship between affective commitment and personal accomplishment, essentially stipulating that as affective commitment increases, so do feelings of personal accomplishment. The p-value and t-values for this relationship are shown at .01 (statistical significance) and 2.656, respectively.

Table 28

*Mediation Model Summary, Personal Accomplishment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>3.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Years, Gender, Level, Affective, Continuance, Normative

Table 29

*Mediation Coefficients, Personal Accomplishment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.551</td>
<td>5.839</td>
<td>3.862</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>-2.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>2.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>-.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Personal Accomplishment
The final set of regression analyses tested the relationship of the same six independent variables (years teaching, gender, teaching level, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment) to the three subscales of burnout. The one key difference, however, was that a seventh independent variable, teacher-coach status, was added to the grouping. The addition of the teacher-coach variable to the equation was done in an attempt to answer the third question posed by the project, the extent of mediation by organizational commitment on the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout, and to determine the extent (if any) of this mediation. Each of the three analyses in this group was run independently from one another - starting with emotional exhaustion as the dependent variable, then with depersonalization as the dependent variable, ending with personal accomplishment as the dependent variable.

The outcome variable of emotional exhaustion represents an educator’s feelings of emotional fatigue and overextension. The model determined teacher-coach status was not a significant predictor of emotional exhaustion as the p-value for this relationship was .793, well above the accepted threshold of .05. The adjusted r-square value was -.070. The standard error was calculated at 3.510. The relationship between teacher-coach status and emotional exhaustion in this model had an unstandardized beta value of -.320, a standardized beta value of -.045, a standard error of -1.215, and a t-value of -2.63.

Table 30

*Mediation Model Summary, Teacher-Coach Emotional Exhaustion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>3.510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TC Status, Years, Gender, Level, Affective, Continuance, Normative

Table 31
Depersonalization was then tested as the dependent variable to determine the extent to which the independent variables were predictive of this scale of burnout. As in the previous model, teacher-coach status was included in the analysis as the seventh independent variable in the group. Teacher-coach status refers to a teacher fulfilling the dual role of teacher and coach, as opposed to a teacher fulfilling only the teaching role with no added responsibilities as a coach. Much like in the analysis of emotional exhaustion, teacher-coach status proved to be an insignificant predictor of depersonalization. The p-value for this relationship was .771. All other predictor variables in the model were equally as insignificant showing p-values of greater than .05. An adjusted R-square value of -.076 stipulates the model to have a 7.6% shared variance.

Table 32

Mediation Model Summary, Teacher-Coach Depersonalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33

Mediation Coefficients, Teacher-Coach Depersonalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>20.600</td>
<td>6.595</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Teaching</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-1.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>-.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Level</td>
<td>-.696</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC Status</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>1.126</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Dependent Variable: Depersonalization

The third and final analysis tested the impact of teacher-coach status on the sole remaining subscale of burnout - personal accomplishment. Personal accomplishment is intended to assess one’s feelings of value and worth in the work they do. The model shows an adjusted r-square value of .186, and this signifies an 18.6% covariance among variables. The standard error is 2.839. Of the seven total independent variables tested, two of them - years teaching and teacher-coach status were found to be significant predictors of personal accomplishment. The years teaching variable showed an inverse relationship with a beta-coefficient of -.269 and a significance value of .033. Teacher-coach status showed a significant direct relationship with personal accomplishment as the beta-coefficient was .316 and the p-value was .04. Years teaching and teacher-coach status showed t-values of -2.194 and 2.111, respectively.
Table 34

Mediation Model Summary, Teacher-Coach Personal Accomplishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>2.839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), TC Status, Years, Gender, Level, Affective, Continuance, Normative

Table 35

Mediation Coefficients, Teacher-Coach Personal Accomplishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) 24.773</td>
<td>5.758</td>
<td>4.303</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years Teaching -.106</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-.2194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender -.500</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching Level 1.172</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>1.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affective .242</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>1.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuance -.024</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative .047</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC Status 2.074</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>2.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Personal Accomplishment

The analysis of each commitment subscale revealed affective commitment to be predictive of personal accomplishment. As a result, the third step in Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation testing was established. Having determined the existence of the necessary relationships between burnout, teacher-coach status, and affective commitment, the project turned its focus to determining the extent to which organizational commitment was a mediator between teacher-coaches and burnout.
In discussing the project’s findings in this area it would be beneficial to briefly revisit the key findings discussed earlier in the chapter. Teacher-coach status was shown to have a predictive relationship with one subscale of burnout - personal accomplishment. Teacher-coach status was also shown to have a predictive relationship with one specific area of organizational commitment - affective commitment. Conceptually then, teacher-coach status is correlated with both the outcome variable (burnout) and the mediating variable (organizational commitment). Establishing this conceptual chain satisfies the first two steps in Baron and Kenny’s (1986) framework for mediation testing. The third step in the framework calls for the establishment that the mediating variable (affective commitment) is correlated with the outcome variable (personal accomplishment). A regression analysis was performed to determine the answer to this question: whether or not affective commitment (as the mediating variable) had an effect on personal accomplishment (as the outcome variable). The regression analysis indicated there was an effect and that effect was statistically significant.

Mediation can be classified as one of three types: zero, partial or complete (full) mediation. Baron and Kenny (1986) have detailed the process by which to determine the degree of mediation by a mediator variable. For complete mediation to exist, the independent variable must first be proven to impact the dependent variable. It then must be proven to have no effect on the outcome variable when controlling for the mediating variable. Partial mediation would result in a decrease in effect on the outcome variable by the independent variable when controlling for the mediator. No change in the effect of the independent variable on the outcome variable when controlling for the mediator would reveal zero mediation.

The unstandardized beta coefficients in a regression analysis are central figures when determining the extent of mediation. It is this unstandardized beta value that depicts the strength
of the effect, or rate of change of the independent variable on the dependent variable. So, in the case of teacher-coach status and the outcome variable of burnout; teacher-coach status was a significant predictor of personal accomplishment with an unstandardized beta-coefficient of 2.785. An unstandardized coefficient of 2.596 was seen when testing the relationship between teacher-coach status and affective commitment. This decrease in the unstandardized coefficient value portrays evidence of partial mediation by organizational commitment on the relationship between being a teacher-coach and burnout.

**Summary of Results**

The data analysis revealed a significant difference in the burnout experience of teacher-coaches relative to teachers. That dissimilarity is rooted in the verity that teacher-coaches tended to experience significantly higher levels of personal accomplishment relative to the teacher group. On average, teacher-coaches experienced moderate levels of personal accomplishment while teachers experienced low levels of accomplishment (Maslach, 1986). Both groups reported high levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. The difference in personal accomplishment between the two groups was found to be statistically significant.

Teacher-coach status was not the sole significant predictor of personal accomplishment, however, so too was years of teaching experience. Interestingly, however, this predictor was shown to have an inverse relationship with personal accomplishment - uncovering the idea that as teaching experience increases in years, feelings of personal accomplishment tend to decrease. This seems counter logical, as one would assume working with and helping children over an extended period of time would enhance one’s feelings of accomplishment rather than mitigate them.
Teacher-coach status was also shown to be a significant predictor of affective commitment in addition to personal accomplishment. Affective commitment is essentially a sense of loyalty that a professional has to their organization and their propensity to remain with their organization because they want to as opposed to feeling they need to or are obligated to. In other words, this finding suggests teachers who fulfill the additional role of coach tend to feel a stronger sense of loyalty to their organization than teachers who do not take on the additional role as a coach. Teacher-coach status was only found to be a significant predictor of affective commitment and not of either of the other two subscales - continuance or normative commitment. Aside from this uncovering, both the teacher and teacher-coach groups tended to have similar experiences in continuance and normative commitment.

The present project tested the mediational hypothesis that organizational commitment impacted the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout since teacher-coach status was shown to have a predictive relationship with both emotional exhaustion and with affective commitment. Affective commitment was then tested for its effect on personal accomplishment pursuant to the framework of mediation testing by Baron and Kenny (1986). This mediation testing requires three key relationships to exist before determining the degree of mediation that exists. So, with respect to the terms of this project - three key relationships needed to exist before determining the degree of mediation by organizational commitment: a) a correlation between teacher-coach status and burnout, b) a correlation between teacher-coach status and organizational commitment, and c) a correlation between organizational commitment and burnout. The analyses showed all three of these relationships to exist.

The project shifted its focus to determining the degree of mediation by affective commitment on the relationship between teacher-coaches and personal accomplishment. This
determination required a review of the effect of teacher-coach status on these relationships by revisiting the unstandardized beta-coefficients for each. In the end, a sizable decrease in effect was seen on burnout (personal accomplishment) from teacher-coach status when controlling for organizational commitment (affective commitment) and thus, the findings pointed to affective commitment as a partial mediator of the relationship between teacher-coaches and personal accomplishment.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

This project sought an exploration of the burnout construct in teacher-coaches relative to teachers. Teacher-coaches fulfill a dual-natured role of teacher and of coach, and as a result, or more greatly exposed to role stress, namely role conflict. An extensive review of the literature on role conflict details the propensity for role conflict to evolve to burnout. Despite this inherent added vulnerability to burnout, a study by Richards (2013) concluded teacher-coaches to have a like experience with burnout relative to teachers, and while the onset of burnout is dependent on a myriad of internal and external factors, this study postulated the existence of a construct uniquely present within teacher-coaches yet to be explored. This study further postulated this unidentified construct existed in teacher-coaches more so than in teachers, but it was to some extent shielding the teacher-coach from the added exposure to burnout. Seeking clarity on these hypotheses would provide the extant literature on teacher-coaches and burnout a more staunch substantiation of the findings by Richards (2013).

While stress is not solely responsible for burnout, this project uniquely delved into an not yet explored - the positive aspects associated with the role of teacher-coach whereas thus far the extant literature had exclusively examined the negative facets associated with the role.

There is a close association between burnout and turnover. As a result, studies pertaining to employee turnover were considered during the literature review portion of the project. The review of the literature on turnover led to the emergence of the conceptual prospect that organizational commitment may, to some extent, shield a professional from burnout. This was considered plausible in light of the finding that organizational commitment was antithetical to employee turnover. After further exploration of organizational commitment, it was uncovered
that heightened levels of organizational commitment, namely affective commitment, was present in collegiate-level coaches (Turner, 2001). Thus, the project had established two pivotal findings in the search for potential burnout mitigation in teacher-coaches - that a: organizational commitment was antithetical to turnover in the workplace and was likely antithetical to burnout given the proximate association between burnout and turnover, and b: elevated levels of organizational commitment, specifically affective commitment, were present in coaches at the college level.

Uncovering this conceptual framework led to the establishment of three distinct research questions that would guide the investigation moving forward:

1. To what extent is being a teacher-coach associated with higher levels of burnout?
2. To what extent is being a teacher-coach associated with higher levels of organizational commitment?
3. To what extent does organizational commitment mediate the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout?

The study would follow a quantitative path in search of the answers to each research question. The study proposed the utilization of multiple regression analysis and mediation testing on the collected data. Survey instruments, widely known and accepted as accurate and reliable were used to measure levels of burnout and organizational commitment in participants. The project employed the 22-item Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educators Survey (MBI-ES) developed by Christina Maslach (1986) and the 18-item Revised Organizational Commitment Survey (OCS) developed by Meyer and Allen (1993) to assess the levels of burnout and organizational commitment in its participants, respectively.
The MBI-ES instrument identifies burnout as a three-pronged construct, that is, burnout is measured in three separate subscales. The first burnout subscale is that of emotional exhaustion. Emotional exhaustion is essentially the feeling of mental fatigue, emotional overextension, and energy depletion resulting from chronically stressful conditions in the workplace, whereas the second subscale of burnout is identified as depersonalization. Depersonalization, also commonly referred to as cynicism, refers to the negative outlook or perspective a professional may develop toward the people they work with. The third and final piece of the burnout pie, so to speak, is personal accomplishment, in the sense that personal accomplishment refers to feelings of competence and high self-efficacy.

The project also leveraged the framework of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) for testing mediation in a relationship. The final research question of the project was rooted in the possibility that organizational commitment mediated the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout, and as a result, the third and final task of the project was to determine to what extent this mediation existed.

The study was centered on teachers in Orange County, NY., for its thriving academic and athletic programs. Orange County is located in upstate New York, roughly 50 miles northwest of New York City. The 86 total public schools in the county educate approximately 57,000 students in grades K-12. Orange County was also an attractive location for the study due to its estimated population of 431 teacher-coaches.

Summary of Results
**Question 1.** Regression analysis revealed teacher-coach status to be predictive of burnout, specifically personal accomplishment. This finding suggests the coaching role was indicative of a greater, more enhanced sense of value and meaning in the work that is done.

Additionally, the study concluded personal accomplishment was predicted by a second variable, years of teaching experience, and this relationship was indirect. Essentially, this finding suggests that as years of teaching experience increased, feelings of personal accomplishment tended to decrease. This seems somewhat obscure as it is reasonable to presume an educator who works with and helps students over an increased period of time would experience an increased sense of personal accomplishment over time.

**Question 2.** Regression analysis indicated teacher-coach status to be predictive of organizational commitment in the sense that being a teacher-coach was predictive of affective commitment. Affective commitment is characterized by feelings of loyalty toward an organization and a genuine desire to remain with an organization.

**Question 3.** Lastly, mediation analysis (Baron and Kenny, 1986) concluded there to be no mediation of burnout in teacher-coaches by organizational commitment despite a predictive relationship between affective commitment and personal accomplishment.

**Implications**

The study concluded teacher-coaches to have greater levels of personal accomplishment relative to their teacher counterparts. Teacher-coaches in the sample reported an average coaching experience of 5.3 years while the teacher group reported a significantly higher average level of teaching experience of 12.25 years of experience. Given the inference offered by this study that greater experience tends to diminish the personal accomplishment, it should be stated
the teacher group was significantly more experienced than the teacher-coach group, and this, to some extent, may be responsible for the significant variation in personal accomplishment.

It is plausible to assume the connection between affective commitment and teacher-coach status may, to some extent, be attributable to a unique bond shared by players and coaches more so than a teacher-student relationship may yield, and the heightened sense of loyalty by the coach may largely be due to the affinity they share for their players and the team. This plausibility inevitably leads to the reasonable assertion that the coaching role uniquely possesses elements that contribute to feelings of accomplishment. As such, a coach may be uniquely connected to players through stronger, tighter-knit bonds relative to the teacher, the coaching role is also to a large extent connected with wins, losses and public acknowledgment. A successful teacher-coach in terms of wins and losses may have a propensity to feel greater accomplishment than a teacher-coach who has not had that measure of success.

The coaching role also carries with it an inherent exposure and attention from the community (Foley, 2010) and this community following is greater than the typical classroom teacher receives. This is an important notion given the conclusions of Henry (2016) in that feelings of personal accomplishment are largely dependent on social recognition. As the coaching role is largely connected with a significant community following, it is sensible to see how community recognition of a teacher-coach, in the local newspaper, for example, may yield higher levels of accomplishment relative to a teacher who is not as greatly exposed to public recognition.

Future Research
At the conclusion of the project, there exists key areas worthy of further investigation. Future studies should explore areas tangentially-related to the relationship between school professionals, burnout and commitment using quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods.

One area this project failed to explore is the extent to which winning and losing impact the relationship of the teacher-coach to burnout and/or commitment. In other words, the question of whether or not a teacher-coach will experience high levels of personal accomplishment regardless of past experiences and outcomes remains. At the heart of this potential investigation is the question of whether or not a coach with a losing record can be expected to experience the same spike in accomplishment - and that is precisely an area worthy of exploration.

Future research may also consider the extent to which a specific sport contributes to burnout and/or organizational commitment as the various interscholastic athletic programs require varying degrees of time, responsibility and effort. For example, sports played during the fall season of the school calendar (football, cross country, soccer, etc.) typically require the coach to be present and actively coaching during the summer months whereas sports that take place during the winter and spring seasons do not (ie - baseball, track and field, etc.). Along a parallel line, some sports are simply more popular than others, whereas some sports seemingly receive less of a community following than others. The question that emerges then, is to what extent does the popularity of a sport within a community impact the experience of the coach with respect to burnout and commitment?

As the study concluded, teachers who additionally coach a sports team are more likely to experience enhanced personal accomplishment and greater feelings of affective commitment. There exists, however, the question of whether or not the same can be said for teachers involved in other extra-curricular programs that are not sports per se. For example, can a teacher who
additionally serves as the yearbook club advisor be expected to experience a greater sense of personal accomplishment to their organization than a teacher-coach. Likewise, would a teacher who takes on the role of chess club advisor be subject to greater commitment?

Whereas this study examined teacher-coaches currently coaching a sport, there exists the possibility that burnout and commitment may fluctuate at different points in the year. For example, a teacher-coach scheduled to coach a sport in the spring may feel differently about themselves and their organization in the fall and winter relative to spring when they are actually coaching their sport. Along a parallel line of inquiry, studies ought to explore the impact of the number of sports coached in a given school year as a significant portion of the teacher-coach population coach multiple sports. In other words, are teacher-coaches who coach three school sports teams in a year on the same playing field, so to speak, as those teacher-coaches who coach only one sport in a given year.

**Current Practice**

A primary goal of a research project is to offer evidence-based findings that better inform decisions on a given subject matter. Case in point, the purpose of this project was to better inform current practices in education, namely teachers and burnout. The findings of this study may better inform current practices in the field of education that pertain to teaching, coaching, teacher burnout and teacher commitment both directly and tangentially. For example, the conclusions drawn from this project may reverberate with school leaders in the sense they now favor teaching candidates with an interest in coaching when hiring for an open position within their building or district. The upshot of the project, that teacher-coaches are less inclined to burnout, have a greater sense of accomplishment, and possess heightened feelings of loyalty to their school, may alter the hiring preferences of school leaders.
Along a similar stream of thinking, school leaders with less past proclivity to encourage teacher involvement in athletics may now be better informed to do so in light of the inference that coaching is beneficial to the holistic health of the teacher and to the effectiveness in which they fulfill their professional duties. In light of these findings, school leaders may now encourage teachers to become involved in sports despite the surface-level drawbacks historically associated with the role of teacher-coach; added responsibility and stress, for example.

Schools are required to make arduous decisions concerning extracurricular programs when faced with budgetary shortfalls. School athletic programs have historically been first on the chopping block, so to speak, when programmatic cutbacks are required. This project introduces new, up-to-date empirical evidence that participation in athletics is not only beneficial for students but to teachers as well. This is a reflective dichotomy from the previous research. This initiatory project produced new, gainful insight into how the termination of athletic programs triggers a compound effect that permeates in and through students to teachers.

**Overall Summary**

This project was dedicated to fully exploring the significant problem of burnout in teachers. Emerging research indicates nearly half of all new teachers will leave the profession within five years, and this is due in large part, to a stressful working environment. Teacher turnover is also a detrimental issue, but given the close association between burnout and turnover, this project was focused on burnout. In addition to triggering turnover, teacher burnout leads to the diminished health and performance of the teacher which in turn, leads to the diminished performance of students as students are greatly affected by teacher burnout. Therefore, this project focused its literature review on what was known about teachers, namely teacher-coaches and burnout.
The project focused on the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout as much was already known about the unique challenges, namely role conflict, teacher-coaches are faced with. In essence, the teacher-coach is inclined to a high proclivity of experiencing role conflict. Much research is suggestive of this and suggestive of the verity that role conflict triggers burnout. As the teacher-coach, by virtue of their dual-natured role, are at an increased likelihood of experiencing role conflict, this project sought to more fully explore the nature and implications of that dynamic.

The hypotheses of this project centered around the findings of Richards (2013), one of the few studies to examine the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout. Richards (2013) probed the levels of burnout in over 400 teacher-coaches and concluded it should not be assumed that the teacher-coach will experience higher levels of burnout than the non-coaching teacher. Richards went on to urge researchers to continue exploring this area as more research was needed to” fully comprehend the implications for a teacher-coach.” This concession was a driving force behind this investigation.

To better explain these findings given the increased propensity of the teacher-coach to experience burnout, the study aimed to explore sources of burnout mitigation in teacher-coaches, specifically organizational commitment. It was uncovered that organizational commitment was predictive of low turnover in various organizations, as it was also discovered coaching athletics was indicative of higher levels of commitment, namely affective commitment, or a feeling of loyalty to the organization. A conceptual inquiry emerged, and that was whether or not the same sense of loyalty and commitment existed in coaches at the high school level, and if so, to what extent did that commitment mediate burnout in teacher-coaches.
As such, the project was guided by three distinct areas of inquiry: the relationship of teacher-coaches to burnout, the relationship between teacher-coaches and organizational commitment, and the degree of mediation by commitment in teacher-coach burnout. The project hypothesized teacher-coaches to experience equal levels of burnout, but higher levels of organizational commitment relative to teachers. The project further speculated the increased level of commitment, to some extent, mediated burnout in teacher-coaches.

Regression analysis determined teacher-coach status to be predictive of burnout, in the sense the coaching role was predictive of personal accomplishment. This finding implicates a fairly straightforward effect - the coaching role yields higher levels of personal accomplishment. This particular regression model yielded an unexpected, tertiary finding - that personal accomplishment was also predicted by years of teaching experience. On the surface, this outcome seems logical, however years of teaching experience was shown to be inversely related to personal accomplishment, meaning the participants tended to experience diminished accomplishment as they became more experienced.

Teacher-coaches were found to also possess increased feelings of affective commitment relative to teachers. Feelings of affective commitment are reflective of feelings loyalty to the organization. This is an interesting finding, as it suggests the coaching role leads to a genuine desire to remain with an organization, more so than feelings of obligation and a need to remain. This evidence supports the attestations of the Turner (2001) study.

Having established a link between teacher-coaches, personal accomplishment, and affective commitment, the study then focused on determining the extent to which affective commitment mediated burnout in teacher-coaches through the framework of Baron and Kenny’s (1986) mediation analysis. Essentially, the framework dictates the extent of mediation in a
relationship can be determined by viewing the change in effect when controlling for the mediator. As such, a regression equation was run to determine the effect of teacher-coach status on burnout when controlling for affective commitment. Subsequently, there was evidence of partial mediation by organizational commitment on the relationship between teacher-coaches and burnout as a decrease in effect was seen when controlling for the mediator.

The project concludes its hypotheses were fairly accurate. The coaching role provides teachers with greater feelings of accomplishment - and this serves them well given the declined performance of teachers who do not feel accomplished. Taking on the dual role of coach also enhances a teacher’s sense of loyalty and commitment, thus leaving them more inclined to remain in the position - and this serves students well given the deleterious effects of teacher burnout and turnover. While these enhanced feelings of loyalty were shown to shield the coach from the more significant manifestations of burnout, further investigation is needed to pinpoint why this is so. In the immediate future, however, a simple truth is known here and now; that participation in athletics is good for kids, and also for teachers.

References


Carlson, Teresa B. (1994). Expectations of physical education and their effect on student attitudes toward the subject. *Australian Association for Research in Education.* Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Peter_Hastie2/publication/235913765_The_Student_Social_System_Within_Sport_Education/links/569f97c808ae4af52546b84c/The-Student-Social-System-Within-Sport-Education.pdf


Dworkin, A. G. (1985). When teachers give up: Teacher burnout, Teacher turnover and their impact on children. Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, the University of Texas at Austin.


Lim, S., & Eo, S. (2014). The mediating roles of collective teacher efficacy in the relations of teachers' perceptions of school organizational climate to their burnout. Teaching and


McGee, G. W., & Ford, R. C. (1987). Two (or more?) dimensions of organizational commitment:


Richards, K., & Templin, T. J. (2012). Toward a multidimensional perspective on teacher-coach
role conflict. *Quest, 64*(3), 164-176.


Voloshin, G. V. (2016). Differences in Organizational Commitment Between Male and Female Coaches at the High School Level.


Appendix A

Maslach Burnout Inventory - Educator Survey (Sample Form):

The purpose of this survey is to discover how educators view their job and the people with whom they work closely.

Instructions: On the following pages are 22 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job.

- If you have never had this feeling, select the button under the “never” column. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by selecting the phrase that best describes how frequently you feel that way.

The phrases describing the frequency are:

**How Often:**

- Never
- A few times a year or less
- Once a month or less
- A few times a month
- Once a week
- A few times a week
- Every day

1. I feel emotionally drained from my work.
2. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.
3. I don’t really care what happens to some students.
Appendix B

Commitment Scales: Revised TCM Commitment Questionnaire (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993)

Instructions:

Listed below is a series of statements that represent feelings that individuals might have about the company or organization for which they work. With respect to your own feelings about the particular organization for which you are now working, please indicate the degree of your agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling a number from 1 to 7 using the scale below.

1 = strongly disagree
2 = disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = undecided
5 = slightly agree
6 = agree
7 = strongly agree

Affective Commitment Scale:

1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.
2. I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.
3. I do not feel a strong sense of "belonging" to my organization. (R)
4. I do not feel "emotionally attached" to this organization. (R)
5. I do not feel like "part of the family" at my organization. (R)
6. This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.

Continuance Commitment Scale:
1. Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.

2. It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.

3. Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.

4. I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.

5. If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.

6. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.

**Normative Commitment Scale:**

1. I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer. (R)

2. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.

3. I would feel guilty if I leave my organization now.

4. This organization deserves my loyalty.

5. I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.

6. I owe a great deal to my organization.

Note. (R) indicates a reverse-keyed item. Scores on these items should be reflected (i.e., 1 = 7, 2 = 6, 3 = 5, 4 = 4, 5 = 3, 6 = 2, 7 = 1) before computing scale scores.
## Appendix C

*Teacher-Coach Mean Responses to MBI-ES*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can easily understand how my students feel about things.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Working with people all day is really a strain for me.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I deal very effectively with the problems of my students.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I feel burned out from my work.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I feel very energetic.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel I'm working too hard on my job.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I don't really care what happens to some students.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I feel students blame me for some of their problems.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

*Teacher mean responses to MBI-ES:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>min.</th>
<th>max.</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>std deviation</th>
<th>variance</th>
<th>count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I can easily understand how my students feel about things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Working with people all day is really a strain for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I deal very effectively with the problems of my students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I feel burned out from my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I feel very energetic.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel I'm working too hard on my job.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I don't really care what happens to some students.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I feel students blame me for some of their problems.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix E

**Teacher-Coach Mean Response Scores to OCS instrument.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of &quot;belonging&quot; to my organization.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this organization.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at my organization.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I owe a great deal to my organization.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

*Teacher Mean Responses to OCS Instrument*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with this organization.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I do not feel a strong sense of &quot;belonging&quot; to my organization.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not feel &quot;emotionally attached&quot; to this organization.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I do not feel like &quot;part of the family&quot; at my organization.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Right now, staying with my organization is a matter of necessity as much as desire.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Mean Rating</td>
<td>Median Rating</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MDE</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel that I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would feel guilty if I left my organization now.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>This organization deserves my loyalty.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I owe a great deal to my organization.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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