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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore experience of burnout in Counselor Education faculty. A national sample of Counselor Educators were randomly selected to participate anonymously in the online study. Participants completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) which measures the three dimensions of burnout: exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy, as well as a questionnaire that assessed the faculty members’ perceived fit in their work environment and turnover intention. The final sample consisted of 64 of 850 eligible participants completing the study for a response rate of approximately 8%. As a whole, participants experienced a moderate level of exhaustion, cynicism, or professional inefficacy. MANOVA analysis of the demographic variables found no significant differences based on race and tenure status, but a main effect for gender. Subsequent univariate analyses comparing male and female participants did not reach statistical significant. Cynicism predicted participants’ turnover intent, whereas exhaustion and professional inefficacy were not significant predictors. The results of this exploratory study emphasized the impact cynicism has on turnover intention for Counselor Education faculty. Cynicism often results from dissatisfaction with some aspect of the job or from violations of the psychological contract formed upon hire. Further directions for research in this population are discussed.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction and Literature Review

Universities today are running more like businesses (Miller, 2003) as public and economic forces change the expectations of higher education (Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007). The life of a faculty member is also changing significantly. Universities experiencing financial constraints expect faculty members to be highly efficient entrepreneurs with quantifiable productivity (Gappa et al., 2007). In the Counselor Education and Supervision field, faculty members struggle to balance the demands of scholarship, service, and teaching (Niles, Akos, & Cutler, 2001). Pre-tenured faculty report greater occupational stress than those who are tenured (N. R. Hill, 2009), despite tenured faculty's reporting greater demands on their time due to serving as mentors, experts in the field, and leaders of the profession (Heller Levitt & Hermon, 2009).

Professional expectations vary across the Counselor Education field. In addition to teaching a full course load, expectations typically include scholarship, such as a set number of research, publications, and presentations; department service, such as mentorship and advising; broader service activities such as university, college-wide, departmental, or programmatic duties; community involvement; and a wide variety of other tasks (Asher, Butler, & Jain, 2010; T. E. Davis, Heller Levitt, McGlothlin, & N. R. Hill, 2006). With increased expectations in academia, greater levels of occupational stress can lead to burnout and have negative outcomes for workers, such as turnover, reduced productivity, and dissatisfaction (Gappa et al., 2007, Lackritz, 2004). Few empirical studies, however, have explored the personal consequences of these changes in higher education (See Blix, Cruise, Mitchell, & Blix, 1994; Gmelch, Lovrich, & Wilke, 1984; Lackritz, 2004). Gmelch (1993) stated that “while academicians devote much time and energy to the study of other professions, they rarely turn the scrutiny on themselves” (p. 15). This lack of inquiry results in a dearth of research studying those teaching in higher education.
BURNOUT IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION

In Counselor Education, despite the emphasis on wellness in the educational standards of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2009), only a few empirical studies have investigated the influences of stress and/or occupational wellness on Counselor Educators (See N. R. Hill, 2009; N. R. Hill, 2004; Leinbaugh, Hazler, Bradley, & N. R. Hill, 2003). More broadly, researchers investigated sources of stress for faculty in 80 doctoral-granting universities and found that faculty rated issues of limited time and lack of resources as most stressful (Gmelch et al., 1984). Additionally, faculty rated teaching as more stressful than service and research; self-imposed high standards were also stress-producing for faculty. Harrison detailed the circumstances that can lead to burnout, such as “pressures, conflicts, demands, and too few emotional rewards, accomplishments, and successes” (1999, p. 26). Lackritz (2004) believed that university faculty are “prime candidates” for burnout due to their regular contact with students and other staff at the workplace (p. 719), but few studies have investigated burnout on this level. However, perhaps due to the relative youth of Counselor Education and Supervision as an academic profession, there is a paucity of information regarding stress, burnout, or occupational wellness.

Burnout can occur in any field (Golemiewski, Boudreau, Sun, Barrier, & King, 1998) whenever chronic mismatches between the individual and the job occur. When one accepts a position of employment, a psychological contract is formed, which is a belief system regarding mutual obligations between the employer and the employee that is established during the hiring process and maintained as the individual interacts within the work environment day to day (Rousseau & Schalk, 2000). According to Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001), mismatches can arise between the worker and the work environment and lead to burnout. These mismatches can occur “when the process of establishing a psychological contract leaves critical issues unresolved, or when the working relationship changes to something that a worker finds unacceptable” (p. 413). Mismatches have the potential to occur often in Counselor Education due to the wide variance among different universities regarding expectations for
tenure and promotion (Boyer, 1990). Hence, the fit between the person and the position and job responsibilities in Counselor Education is a particularly salient issue. This study examined burnout in a sample of Counselor Educators to better understand issues of job congruence and turnover intention.

**Statement of the Problem**

In the burnout literature, few studies focus on higher education. Although some researchers have examined burnout and stress in Counselor Education (Bartley, 2005; McCortney, 2005), none have examined the relationship between the areas of worklife and level of burnout in Counselor Education faculty. The few studies that do turn a lens on burnout in higher education address issues such as workload (Lackritz, 2004), specific stressors (Gmelch et al., 1984), consequences of burnout in the university environment (Blix et al., 1994), and relationship between burnout and intention to quit (Moreno-Jimenez, Garrosa Hernández, Carvajal, Gamarra, & Puig 2009). Focused research to understand levels of burnout in faculty members is rare in higher education literature as a whole, but nearly nonexistent in Counselor Education.

It is unknown what roles the areas of worklife (i.e., community, control, fairness, values, reward, and/or workload) will play in the burnout levels of faculty members or how levels of burnout relate to turnover intention in Counselor Education faculty. Knowing how the areas of worklife correlate with burnout and turnover will give greater insight into the circumstances that lead to burnout in this population, and help to explain turnover as well. It is unclear how burnout contributes to faculty members’ leaving Counselor Education positions. Chronic mismatches between the individual and the work environment have been shown to result in burnout and eventually turnover (Leiter & Maslach, 2003). In a study comparing nursing staff from different generations (Baby Boomer and Generation X) in terms of core work values, researchers found that the younger (Generation X) nurses experienced greater mismatches, more symptoms of burnout, and a greater inclination to leave the job (Leiter, Jackson, & Shaughnessy, 2009). Another study with a sample of nurses tested the mediation model in
which cynicism (a subscale of burnout) was a critical predictor for turnover (Leiter & Maslach, 2009).

Finally, in a study of recently graduated nurses, greater person-environment fit led to greater engagement (less burnout) and increased organizational commitment (Cho, Laschinger, & Wong, 2008). These studies utilized the Areas of Worklife scale (AWS) developed by Leiter and Maslach (2003). Few other researchers have used and published their research using the AWS, and none appear to have examined higher education.

Counseling is a field that emphasizes the relationship between people as the foundation of a counselor’s effectiveness (Lambie, 2006). This dynamic is mirrored in the relationship between faculty and students. Counselor Educators emphasize self-awareness, growth, and wellness to their graduate students in counseling (Yager & Tovar-Blank, 2007). It is also important for Counselor Educators to exhibit wellness strategies in their own lives. In a small pilot study, three faculty members interviewed stated that modeling self-care and monitoring student wellness are important parts of their job (Baker, Coaston, & Sebera, 2009). Burnout can be a real threat to graduate students who are completing the program and entering the profession (Coaston, Baker, & Sebera, 2009). Yager and Tovar-Blank (2007) asserted that “If one's mentors are burned out, slowed by sleeplessness, stressed by a spiritual disconnect, or burdened by physical inactivity, it is not positive self-care that will be communicated” (p. 145). Therefore, if an instructor is burned out, students may not take the professor’s message about wellness seriously and the stress may affect students’ motivation to learn (Stern & Cox, 1993; Yager & Tovar-Blank, 2007). N. R. Hill (2004) expressed concern that occupational stress in the individual can also have organizational consequences:

[T]he challenges experienced by pre-tenured faculty members are especially salient for counselor educators because of the isomorphic relationship between counselor educator counselor and counselor-client. The dynamic nature of this relationship encourages Counselor Education as a discipline and pre-tenured counselor educators as individuals to promote
wellness at both individual and systemic levels. Such a focus reflects the philosophical commitment of Counselor Education to enhancing the growth and development of students and clients. (p. 140)

Therefore, attention must be paid to the circumstances and sources of stress in academia to prevent or at least reduce its impact on students and the community.

**Purpose of the Study**

The phenomenon of burnout has been extensively researched in human service professions since it was first described nearly 40 years ago by Freudenberg (1974; Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993). As previously mentioned, few studies have focused on higher education, with one dissertation study focused on burnout in Counselor Educators (Bartley, 2005) and another examined work and life factors that contributed the quality of Counselor Educators’ work experiences (McCortney, 2005). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine factors that impact the level of burnout and turnover intention in Counselor Education faculty members from CACREP- accredited universities in the United States. Further, this study was designed to enhance understanding of the burnout phenomenon in higher education, not only addressing a gap in the literature, but also addressing areas for intervention to reduce and prevent burnout in faculty before it can further impact students. I utilized the person-environment (P – E) fit perspective to study burnout, which encompasses both the individual experience and the job environment by examining perceived fit in the sample.

**Literature Review**

In this literature review, I will begin by addressing the subject of burnout’s transition from being dismissed as ‘pop’ psychology (Maslach & Jackson, 1984) to its current status as a concept rooted in empirical literature (Schaufeli, Leiter, & Maslach, 2009). Throughout its development process, the subject of burnout has been researched, defined, and assessed in a myriad of ways. This review of the burnout research will include support and criticism of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, one of the most
widely used instruments. The next section will focus the history of higher education and changes to higher education in the last few decades. The following section will concentrate on Counselor Education, history of the field, and associated stressors for Counselor Education faculty. The final section will address the areas of worklife and turnover intention. This portion will examine how poor matches in the different areas of worklife can affect the employee and job tenure.

**Defining Burnout**

Maslach and Freudenberger first published research on the burnout phenomenon independently in the mid-1970’s (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Burnout was first discussed as a social problem rather than a scholarly concept, and was given a name, described, and shown to be a reaction to significant stress in the workplace (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993). Freudenberger, working as a psychiatrist at a health clinic, borrowed the term “burnout” from the drug culture (cf., Schaufeli, Leiter et al., 2009). He reported that many of the passionate young volunteers at the clinic eventually exhibited signs of burnout such as depleted energy, low motivation and commitment to the job, and various mental and physical problems (Freudenberger, 1974; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Around the same time, Maslach (1993) observed the phenomenon when interviewing human services workers who talked of emotional exhaustion, distance and detachment, and negative assessment of work performance. When researchers presented a paper at an American Psychological Association convention in 1973, reactions from human services workers were enthusiastic, but administrators were dismissive of the phenomenon (Maslach & Jackson, 1984).

Burnout was at first thought to be a fad. When given a psychometric manuscript describing the Maslach Burnout Inventory, reviewers rejected it unread, explaining that “we do not publish ‘pop’ psychology” (Maslach & Jackson, 1984, p. 139). As the media publicized the concept, the term became somewhat meaningless because it began to seem as though everyone was burnt out. Morrow (1981) described the faddish nature of burnout:
Social workers and nurses burn out from too much association with hopelessness. Police officers burn out. Professional athletes burn out. Students burn out. Executives burn out. Housewives burn out. And, as every parent knows, there usually comes a moment in late afternoon when baby burnout occurs—all of his [sic] little circuits overloaded, the child feels too wrought up to fall asleep (p.1).

As the media coverage expanded, many administrators and supervisors in organizations did not take the problem seriously, which prevented potentially helpful interventions from being implemented (Maslach & Jackson, 1984). Hence, publicity in the early eighties negatively impacted both scholarly distribution of work related to burnout and practical assistance for those truly experiencing burnout in the workplace.

The early writings on burnout emphasized the interaction between the person and the job environment (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Maslach and Jackson (1981) focused on those who did “people work” stating that “chronic stress can be emotionally draining and poses the risk of ‘burnout’” (p. 99). However, as researchers began to study burnout more systematically, new assessment tools were developed, larger populations were studied, and the concept of burnout spread from human services and education to diverse fields such as air traffic controllers (Dell’Erba, Venturi, Rizzo, Procu, & Pancheri, 1994) and those working in information technology (King & Sethi, 1997). It came to be understood that burnout could occur in fields not defined by an employee interacting with others in a service capacity. Burnout is a global phenomenon that affects workers in all lines of work, which some researchers believe is at pandemic proportions (Golemiewski, Boudreau, Sun, Barrier, & King, 1998).

Defining burnout was difficult in the early literature because there was little consensus of what being burnt out meant. In the early years, Maslach and Jackson (1984) found that the scholarly community accepted research on “job stress” more easily than “burnout”. Over time, however, burnout came to be understood as a multidimensional phenomenon with three core components: emotional exhaustion, cynical attitudes toward the recipients of one’s services, and dissatisfaction with one’s job...
accomplishments (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The Maslach Burnout Inventory, now in its third edition (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996), still uses three components. However, today, a greater understanding of the relationships among the variables has evolved due to extensive research using the instrument.

**Three dimensions of burnout.** Maslach (1993) defined burnout thusly: “a psychological syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with other people in some capacity” (p. 20). The tripartite definition was developed through exploratory research rather than being theoretically generated (Maslach, 1993). This multifaceted concept using emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment is somewhat different from unidimensional frameworks (e.g., The Burnout Measure [BM] created by Pines & Aronson, 1988) that provide a single global burnout score designating simply whether or not one is burnt out. The three dimensions provide greater detail to the relational context of burnout by focusing on the interpersonal work experience (Maslach, 1993). However, in the most recent edition of the MBI manual, the developers expanded the definition to include those who work in “not so clearly people-oriented” fields outside of human services or education (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001, p. 402). The Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) uses broader terms, refers to a more general job (e.g., not explicitly human services or education), and is not focused solely on the relationship between service provider and recipient (Maslach, Leiter, & Schaufeli, 2008). The labels for these terms are now exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy, and relate to the individual’s relationship with the work itself (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996).

**Exhaustion.** Exhaustion has been the most studied component of the three (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Exhaustion is the individual stress dimension of burnout, occurring when a person’s resources are depleted and the person feels overextended (Taris, Le Blanc, Schaufeli, & Schaufeli, 2005). Formerly termed emotional exhaustion, it was thought to be due to excessive psychological and
emotional demands in helping professions leading to feeling “drained or used up” (Schwab, Jackson, & Schuler, 1986, p. 14), which assumes an earlier high level of arousal (Jackson, Schwab, & Schuler, 1986). For instance, in the existential model of burnout, one must be highly motivated to experience burnout: “In other words, in order to burn out, one has first be ‘on fire.’ A person with no such initial motivation can experience stress, alienation, depression, an existential crisis, or fatigue, but not burnout” (Pines, 1993, p. 41). Some considered exhaustion to be the key element in the burnout phenomenon (See Shirom, 1989); however, Maslach (1993) viewed this as overly simplifying a complex phenomenon to a new word for stress. Nevertheless, exhaustion is, in fact, often the first reaction to work place stress (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). When a worker becomes exhausted, coping capacity often determines how the individual succeeds (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Emotional demands can cause human service providers to distance themselves from their clients (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001), whereas workers in other fields may develop a cold, detached attitude toward their work (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998).

**Cynicism or depersonalization.** Depersonalization refers to detachment from other people (Maslach, 1993). In the Maslach Burnout Inventory - Human Services survey (MBI-HSS) the term depersonalization refers to the distance professionals may put between themselves and their service recipients (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). However, in the MBI-GS, the term cynicism is used to reflect a detachment from one’s work rather than from professional relationships on the job (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996). Cynicism refers to a distant, apathetic attitude toward work (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). This is the interpersonal dimension of burnout (Taris et al., 2005). When employees feel cynical about their work, they may reduce their involvement in the job. This negative or detached view toward work can damage the worker’s well-being and his or her ability to work effectively (Maslach & Leiter, 1997).

**Reduced professional efficacy or personal accomplishment.** The loss of personal accomplishment at work or feelings of inefficacy are related to the experience of exhaustion and cynicism; however, this is a complex relationship. This item has an inverse relationship with the other
scales, so as exhaustion and cynicism increase, personal accomplishment and efficacy are reduced. This third dimension of burnout is described as a reduction in feelings of competence or success at work (Maslach, 1993). Jackson, Schuler, and Schwab (1986) suggested that feelings of ineffectiveness have a demotivating effect on the worker and likened it to learned helplessness, in which one learns that personal actions make no difference and stops trying. Self-confidence may play a role in inefficacy.

Those who have lost confidence in their abilities and are also experiencing exhaustion and cynicism are likely to suffer more greatly (Maslach, Leiter et al., 2008). Therefore, a work environment with overwhelming demands can contribute to exhaustion or cynicism, and a worker who has symptoms of exhaustion and cynicism can experience a resulting lack of effectiveness in their job (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Reduced efficacy can occur simultaneously with, but independent of, exhaustion and cynicism (Leiter, 1993; Schutte, Toppinen, Kalimo, & Schaufeli, 2000). This complicated relationship with the other two subscales has spurred other researchers to question the legitimacy of this third subscale.

Psychometrically, the reduced personal accomplishment subscale has performed unpredictably in a number of studies (Cordes, and Dougherty, 1993; Lee and Ashforth, 1996; Leiter, 1993; Kallith, O’Driscoll, Gillespie, & Bluedorn, 2000). Some researchers have suggested that the subscale may develop independently of the other two subscales (Cordes, & Dougherty, 1993; Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Leiter, 1993) or related in another more complex way (Cordes &Dougherty, 1993). Kallith, O’Driscoll, Gillespie, and Bluedorn (2000), using structural equation modeling (SEM), found emotional exhaustion the core element of burnout, with depersonalization a “subsidiary dimension”, and reduced personal accomplishment not “a major dimension of burnout” (p. 46-47). Similarly, Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, and Christensen (2005) concluded that it “may not be a part of the total concept of burnout” (p. 194). Schaufeli and Salanova (2007) have suggested that these perplexing results could be a statistical artifact related to efficacy and inefficacy not being perfectly negatively correlated with each other. For
example, when you are not happy you may not necessarily be sad, and vice versa. Nevertheless, confirmatory factorial analysis found the fit for the three dimensions superior to other models, such as two factor models focusing on emotional exhaustion and cynicism, with reduced personal accomplishment separately factoring across occupational groups and nations (Finland, Sweden, and The Netherlands; Schutte et al., 2000). Other studies have found the three factor model superior (but not perfect) over two or four factor models (Byne, 1991; Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, & Kantas, 2003; Therefore, in this study, the commonly accepted three dimensions of burnout were used: exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy.

Relationships Among the Dimensions of Burnout

Researchers have investigated possible causal relationships among the dimensions of burnout to help determine its etiology and make early recognition possible. Although the issue of causality remains unresolved (Taris et al., 2005), exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy appear to interact in dynamic ways. Maslach (1993) suggested that individuals first experience emotional exhaustion, then depersonalization, and finally reduced personal accomplishment. Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (1993) found sufficient evidence to indicate that exhaustion can lead to depersonalization, but that reduced personal accomplishment could occur concurrently with depersonalization. In an early 1998 study, Leiter and Maslach found that exhaustion leads to greater depersonalization as an attempt to protect one’s self from the exhaustion resulting from work. Later Leiter (1993) reversed that opinion asserting that there is insufficient evidence exists to support this claim. Research by Golembiewski and Munzenrider (1988), in contrast, found the process to begin with depersonalization, lead to reduced personal accomplishment, and end with emotional exhaustion. Schaufeli, Maslach, and Marek (1993) called for longitudinal studies to establish causal relationships; however, Schaufeli and Enzman (1998) found that longitudinal studies have been unable to replicate results from cross-sectional studies and concluded that methodological issues may be to blame. A recent study (Taris et al., 2005) offered some
support for high levels of exhaustion triggering depersonalization (cf., Lee & Ashforth, 1993; Leiter & Malach, 1988) and another study using a teacher sample suggested high depersonalization scores can lead to low personal accomplishment (cf., Golembiewski & Munzenrider, 1988; Leiter & Maslach, 1988). Even with research indicating that burnout is a developmental process, more research is essential to indicate any causal relationships (Taris et al., 2005).

Early burnout researchers viewed burnout as a single concept, rather than a multidimensional one, and developed measures to assess a global burnout score (see Shirom, 1989; Pines & Aronson, 1988). Maslach (1993) suggested that the three dimensional model is not at odds with a single dimension. She further argued that a multidimensional conceptual model incorporates the exhaustion component, while broadening the focus to include the other two dimensions: depersonalization (a response to others) and reduced personal accomplishment (a response to self). In addition, Leiter (1993) asserted that there is insufficient information about the interrelationships of the three components to consider combining them. He went on to say “a unidimensional burnout measure would provide the convenience at the cost of conceptual accuracy” (p.239). Individuals experience burnout in many different ways, necessitating a multidimensional framework such as that used in the present study to best understand the phenomenon.

Symptoms and Outcomes of Burnout

Burnout is a unique phenomenon with a variety of associated symptoms. Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998) organized individual symptoms into five types:

(a) Affective symptoms, including low mood, low energy, irritability, and anxiety;

(b) Cognitive symptoms, which cause the professional to be cynical, feel out of control, and feel a sense of failure as one begins to make minor mistakes, become forgetful, or have difficulty making decisions;
(c) Physical symptoms, such as chronic fatigue, anxiety with hyperventilation, psychosomatic disorders (e.g., ulcers or other gastrointestinal complaints), and physiological reactions such as hypertension;

(d) Behavioral symptoms, characterized by heightened arousal resulting in either impulsive action or procrastination and indecisiveness; consumption of substances to reduce unwanted symptoms (e.g., caffeine, tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs) increasing the possibility of addiction; and interpersonal difficulties as a result of withdrawn or aggressive behavior;

(e) Motivational symptoms, influencing the professional’s enthusiasm, resulting in demoralization and disillusionment with the image he or she once had of the job.

These various symptoms are experienced differently depending on the individual. Because symptoms vary widely, consistent with the individual experience of stress, treatment should be individualized according to the specific problem (Faber, 2000). This approach makes sense because the stressors that result in burnout differ between persons in terms of number, intensity, and timing of stressors (Golemiewski et al., 1998).

Since the symptoms of burnout differ among individuals, the workplace outcomes are also varied. When burnout is rampant in a work environment, job performance and the health of the employees can suffer (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Employees experiencing burnout are more likely to be absent, intend to leave the job, actively search for new work, or actually leave the job (du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Goodman & Boss, 2002; Kallith, O’Driscoll, Gillespie & Bluedorn, 2000; Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). For those who choose to stay, burnout reduces productivity (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001) as well as both self-rated and supervisor-rated performance (Parker & Kuli, 1995), and may lead to greater interpersonal conflict with supervisors and recipients of care (Fujiwara, Tsukishima, Tsutsumi, Kawakami, & Kishi, 2003). Burnout can be contagious in a job site and
veteran employees may model negative work attitudes reflecting their own burnout (Buunk & Schaufeli, 1993).

**Theoretical Foundations**

The person-environment framework is helpful to understand burnout. As used in the present research, this perspective is an organizational approach with a strong background in the career development field (Binning, Lebreton, & Adorno, 2006). This perspective requires an understanding of the person, his or her attributes, relevant aspects of the environment where behavior is exhibited, and an understanding of the process of interaction between the person and the environment. However, it is not the only way to view burnout. There are four approaches to burnout in the literature (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998): (a) individual, (b) interpersonal, (c) organizational, and (d) societal.

Individual approaches are based on various psychological theories (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Individual approaches focus on demographic differences, personality characteristics, and attitudes toward the job environment (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). For example, Pines' (1993) existential model of burnout was predicated on the assumption that only highly motivated employees can experience burnout. Pines (1993) asserted that individuals have a need to feel heroic and to feel that they matter. She stated “when people try to find meaning in their life through work and feel they have failed, the result is burnout” (Pines, 1993, p. 33). Using psychoanalytic theory Pines (2000) suggested that a worker’s “greatest passion is located where some unresolved childhood issue lies” (p. 634); occupational success provides existential significance and begins to heal childhood wounds. The approach was developed from case studies, clinical experience, research results, and numerous burnout workshops (Pines & Aronson, 1988). Other individual approaches focus on concepts such as progressive disillusionment, expectations that do not correspond to the work situation, or personality characteristics such as narcissism (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). These theories emphasize the idea that job stress is a result of an individual’s high motivation to help, a mismatch between the professional’s intentions for
the job and the reality of the job experience, or an inability to cope with the job stress (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). These approaches place the responsibility of burnout solely on the worker. To remedy burnout, the individual must make personal changes by improving the sense of meaning derived from work (Pines, 2000).

Interpersonal approaches, on the other hand, focus more on interactions within the social context of the job and have greater empirical support than individual theories (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Maslach and Jackson (1981) first proposed burnout to be the result of emotional overload from interacting professionally with recipients of the worker’s services (e.g., clients, students). Emotional overload results from dealing with demanding people who command a great deal of attention, effort, and time (Maslach, 1982). Equity theory is useful for understanding the interpersonal nature of burnout. According to the theory, “people pursue reciprocity in interpersonal relationships and organisational relationships: what they invest and gain from a relationship should be proportional to the investments and gains of the other party in the relationship” (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998, p. 120). This relationship, also described by Freudenberger and Richelson (1980; as cited in Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998), leads to burnout when the rewards of the job are not proportionate to the effort exerted. Therefore, when the reward is not worth the effort exerted, burnout is more likely.

These early theories proposed a causal relationship between the dimensions of burnout, in that emotional exhaustion leads to depersonalization, which eventually results in reduced personal accomplishment (Leiter & Maslach, 1988). Consequently, the interpersonal emotional demands of the workplace leads to distancing strategies from clients, such as using derogatory labels, professional jargon, or intellectualization (Maslach, 1982). Depersonalization (or cynicism) is then thought to be a reaction to the need for such distance (Leiter & Maslach, 1988; Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). However, co-workers and supervisors can also influence a worker’s burnout.
According to the emotional contagion model, individuals enter the organization and can be influenced by their burnt-out colleagues (Bakker & Schaufeli; 1993; Buunk & Schaufeli, 1993). Bakker and Schaufeli (2001) found some support for the idea of emotional contagion with general practitioners in the Netherlands but could not conclusively determine the mechanism of contagion. The process could be unconscious, as individuals unconsciously mimic the emotions and behaviors of others. Conversely, contagion could occur after hearing others making negative statements about patients; individuals may develop feelings of depersonalization when these statements remind them of their own patients who seem unappreciative of their help. Finally, individuals who are most susceptible to experiencing the emotions of others are more likely to become emotionally exhausted and therefore most vulnerable to emotional contagion (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2001). These results are similar to those from another study examining the emotional demands of service careers and the need to display appropriate emotions. Morris and Feldman (1996) found that the higher the frequency, duration, and variability of emotions expressed during the workday, the greater the risk for burnout. Clearly, the social environment of the workplace can play a role in burnout; however, there are other aspects of the work environment that also contribute to burnout.

Organizational approaches are broader than interpersonal theories and focus on the organizational reality of the job environment. While differing greatly, each of these theories accounts for the effect the organization can have on the burnout level of the individual. Reality shock is a common experience in a new work environment. Chermiss (1980) studied 28 new employees entering human service professions and examined their early experiences and the factors contributing to changes in these professionals’ demeanors and behaviors. Chermiss’ sources of stress focused more on the work place than the person (e.g., bureaucratic interference and lack of collegiality). In another organizational approach, Golembiewski and colleagues developed a phase model using a modified version of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) with commercial organization employees. According to the phase
model, depersonalization is followed by a lack of personal accomplishment, and then emotional exhaustion occurs (Golembiewski & Munzenrder, 1988). This developmental process specifies a different ordering than that of Leiter and Maslach’s (1988) model in which emotional exhaustion leads to depersonalization, which causes reduced personal accomplishment. Goodman and Boss (2002) used the phase model to understand the relationship between burnout and turnover. The researchers found a significant difference in burnout phases (i.e., low, intermediate, and high) between those who stay and those who leave; interestingly, no significant difference was found between individuals who left voluntarily and those whose employment was terminated. Regardless of the order of events, it is clear that burnout has negative consequences for the individual and the organization (Golembiewski & Munzenrder, 1988; Goodman & Boss, 2002; Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001).

Maslach and Leiter (1997) expanded their own theory of burnout from an interpersonal to an organizational focus, both moving away from the notion that burnout occurs only in human service professions and emphasizing the mismatch between the person and the environment. In this model, burnout is broadened to include meaning-making in the career process. When an individual accepts a position, person – environment fit matters. Perceptions and behaviors have a reciprocal relationship with the work environment; how employees make meaning of their work can affect their satisfaction with the job, commitment to the organization, and work performance (Lindholm, 2003). Burnout occurs from mismatches in one, some, or all of the six areas of worklife (Leiter & Maslach, 2005). In the organizational approach when a mismatch occurs, the focus is placed on the relationship rather than on either the individual or the organization per se (Leiter & Maslach, 1999). Interventions then can be targeted toward improving one’s relationship with the job (Leiter & Maslach, 2005).

Beyond the impact on the individual and the job, some theorists approached burnout from a more global framework. The societal approach differs significantly from earlier approaches, deemphasizing the subjective experience in favor of cultural or social factors within the world of work.
(Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Karger (1981) advocated for future researchers investigate the social, political, and economic context of the problem. Karger believed that burnout is a result of the objectification of professionals’ skills as a market commodity comparable to the industrial alienation in the workplace described by Karl Marx (1844, as cited by Karger, 1981). As a result, work loses its personal meaning for the professional.

Handy (1988) suggested that individual models of burnout could be supplemented by the consideration of the sociological notion of manifest versus latent functions of the work places. In a study illustrating these concepts, Handy (1991) described the stress in psychiatric nursing. The manifest function of the nurses’ role is to treat psychiatric patients, while the latent function is to control the patients’ behavior. The contradictions between the two functions result in stress. Handy asserted that the subjective experience is influenced strongly by the social context, which is often not considered in psychological (i.e., individual) approaches to burnout. These approaches tend to neglect organizational and societal issues, the interaction between personal meaning and organizational challenges, and the influence of power in relationships in the work environment.

**Summary**

To summarize, burnout refers to feelings of exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced efficacy in the work environment. Over the last 30 years, burnout has been conceptualized using various theoretical frameworks and there is no one overarching theory of burnout. Each type of approach focuses more heavily on certain aspects (e.g., personality characteristics) and deemphasizes others (e.g., societal influences). Burnout can be a mismatch in the person-environment relationship. Consistent with a person-environment model, burnout in counselor training programs is predicated on the nature of the academic environment in which faculty work. In the next section, the history and nature of the academic environment is explored followed by a detailed history of Counselor Education and a description of the field and the job.
Higher Education

In the United States, accessibility and educational philosophy have changed and developed significantly throughout history. Through a brief review of the history of academia in this country, one can better understand the context and role of the faculty member. Further, there is a review history of Counselor Education that concludes with a description of state of the profession at the time of this study. Expected roles and activities, occupational wellness, and person-environment factors contributing to the overall fit in higher education are also discussed.

History of higher education. From Plato to Medieval Europe, academia has a long history. The first universities were established in the twelfth century in Europe to teach arts, law, medicine, and theology (Lucas, 2006). In early colonial America, religion was the impetus for the establishment of many early universities (Geiger, 1999). Although earning a college degree was not a requirement for most positions (Thelin, 2004), graduates from early universities were involved in socially prestigious occupations such as ministry, law, and public affairs (Geiger, 1999). Academia attracted a myriad of students; many were clergy, subsistence farmers’ children, and eventually women (Thelin, 2004). Between 1800 and 1850, the “College Boom” exploded more than 200 colleges and universities into existence; however, without state assistance, many struggled to stay afloat.

From the mid-nineteenth century through the early twentieth century, federal and philanthropic support greatly expanded university offerings and focus, both at the graduate and undergraduate levels. The federal government became involved in higher education through the Morrill Act of 1862, which provided land grants subsequently used in many areas to establish colleges (Thelin, 2004). Later, the Morrill Act of 1890 afforded federal funding to these new land-grant colleges and provided funding for African American education by establishing Negro colleges (Thelin, 2004). In 1900, the presidents of 14 well-established institutions developed the Association of American Universities, which continued the
conversation regarding the role and nature of the American university (Speicher, 2010). Enrollment during this time grew due to women’s assimilation into coeducational institutions (Geiger, 1999).

Enrollment continued to grow despite the two World Wars (Gieger, 1999). Following the passage in 1944 of the G.I. Bill, veterans were funded to further their education in postsecondary institutions (Thelin, 2004). Funding from sources such as the National Science Foundation encouraged universities to further grow and benefit from the Cold War defense and competition with the Soviet Union (Geiger, 1999). The Educational Amendments of 1972 represented the government’s early venture into student financial aid by providing federally funded fellowships, grants, and low-interest loans to students who lacked the resources to pursue higher education (Lucas, 2006). To provide potential students with greater access, choice, and affordability, the federal government founded the Basic Educational Opportunities Grant, otherwise known as the Pell Grant (Thelin, 2004).

As higher education transitioned toward a new century, a myriad of issues affected delivery of courses, public perception, and administration of the university setting. The 1960s and 1970s were characterized by student dissatisfaction, political activism, and civil rights clashes (Lucas, 2006). Academic accountability, effectiveness, and educational equity became increasingly important in higher education, as some in education predicted the closing of large numbers of universities and colleges and as government officials and the public began losing confidence in higher education (Thelin, 2004). For-profit universities, some utilizing distance technology (e.g., University of Phoenix), gained popularity and diverted students and federal funds away from more established brick and mortar institutions (Lechuga, 2006; Lucas, 2006). Within these more traditional institutions, classes and dormitories were overcrowded and some critics lamented a perceived lack of attention to undergraduate education (Lucas, 2006). The public became further critical of the higher educational system at this time, due to popular media portrayal of faculty as “content, lazy, and arrogant” with jobs that are “low-pressured, complete with short working hours, high salaries, and lifetime job security” (Hagedorn, 2000, p. 6).
Under the scrutiny of the public and state legislatures, the status quo was no longer sufficient in many universities (Millis, 1994). As the student body became more diverse, faculty development committees proposed curriculum changes to improve multicultural content and the quality of teaching (Millis, 1994).

In response to internal and social pressures, higher education leadership increased public campaigns, focused on faculty and student development and recruitment, and expanded the number of adjunct professors used to teach courses (Gappa et al., 2007; Millis, 1994). Through public relations campaigns toward the community and politicians, financial appropriation increased and higher education rebounded (Thelin, 2004). To meet the high expectations of state government in the 1990’s, university presidents attempted to recruit the best faculty, doctoral students, and athletes (Thelin, 2004). At the same time, concern about faculty shortages spurred greater research into the quality of work life and satisfaction of faculty (Johnsrud & Heck, 1998). Tack (1991) predicted intense competition for female and minority faculty as the student body became more diversified. Therefore, faculty development efforts increased to prepare professors to meet the needs of a changing student body with more non-traditional, female, minority, and part-time students (Millis, 1994). Widespread faculty shortages have not occurred; however, the employment outlook for those with doctorates is uncertain due to universities’ increasing reliance on part-time or non-tenure track instructors because of financial constraints (Lechuga, 2006; Zusman, 1999). Graduate students wishing to enter academia in the current educational environment have an uncertain future (O’Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008; Zusman, 1999). Poor work environments, stress due to doing more with less, and unclear expectations can result in greater distress and eventual turnover (Gappa et a., 2007; O’Meara et al., 2008). While some faculty respond to an uncertain career future by developing their expertise, others simply try not to lose ground (O’Meara et al., 2008).

In summary, higher education is a complicated environment that has evolved greatly over the last few centuries. The student body has grown more diverse and has evolved expectations for their
educational experience. The professional expectations for faculty have changed and increased over the years. Financial constraints and accountability have influenced daily functioning at the university. The Counselor Education profession is a microcosm within academia and faculty members experience similar opportunities, uncertainties, and challenges.

**Counselor Education and Supervision profession.** Today, Counselor Education is a growing field producing well-trained professionals. The profession is only a little over 100 years old. Counselor Education developed out of the Industrial Revolution and in response to demographic changes in the population resulting from the influx of immigrants to the United States (Aubrey, 1977). Ginter (2002) eloquently described the profession’s origin: “counseling emerged during a socially turbulent period that straddled the ending of one century and the beginning of another, a period marked by great change that caused a major shift in the way individuals viewed themselves and others” (p. 220). The counseling profession’s charter members were primarily teachers, administrators, and those who considered themselves as social advocates (Aubrey, 1983; Gladding, 2009). Individuals such as Frank Parsons, Jesse B. Davis, Clifton Beers, and Eli Weaver began the profession based on social reform (Aubrey, 1983; Gladding, 2009). To better understand the state of the profession today, it is important to know the history of the field.

**History of the field.** Much of the focus in the beginning was on guidance in the schools, which assisted students with vocational and educational decisions. Jessie B. Davis is credited with legitimizing a systemized guidance program in the late 1800s and early 1900s, and moving it into the school curriculum (Aubrey, 1982). Around the same time, Frank Parsons, now referred to as the founder of guidance, was a social reformer charged with bringing vocational assistance to youth outside the school environment (Ginter, 2002). Vocational guidance also entered public schools and counselors were expected to work from a “Parsonian model” (Aubrey, 1982, p. 199) based primarily on logic, observation, and the analytical skills of the vocational worker. Educational guidance entered the schools
in the 1920’s and competed for popularity with vocational guidance in the 1930’s. Educational guidance was broader and concerned with the process of education and the experience in school. Developmental guidance followed, based in social and behavioral sciences, and would continue to impact the career world for decades to come. However, counseling itself did not enter the professional literature until 1931 where it was viewed as a supplemental service to assist in one’s vocational development (Aubrey, 1982, 1983).

Following World War II, numerous changes took place in the counseling world; however, events occurring within the 1950’s impacted the early counseling profession most (Aubrey, 1977). Within the profession, the early 1950’s was the birth of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) in 1952, formed by combining the National Association of Guidance Supervisors and Counselor Trainers (NAGCT; now Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, ACES), American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA; Aubrey, 1977). The official merger took place in Los Angeles (Herr, 1985) at a joint convention of the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA) and the ACPA, with input from NAGCT and the Student Personnel Association for Teacher Education (SPATE; now Association for Humanistic Education and Development, AHEAD). This merger was intended to strengthen the profession by creating a shared structure intended to achieve goals impossible to implement by special interest groups (Herr, 1985). The American School Counseling Association (ASCA) joined APGA as a division in 1953 (Gladding, 2009). Global events, such as the Russians’ launching of Sputnik in 1957, placed greater importance on educational guidance in school systems. The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 resulted in the number of school counselors growing exponentially (Aubrey, 1982). These events all influenced the identity development of the counseling profession.

In the early 1960’s, the profession was in its adolescence and with it experienced the identity problems characteristic of this life development stage in humans (Aubrey, 1977, 1983). Professionals
were deluged with counseling methodologies (e.g., existential counseling, reality therapy, behavioral counseling, and gestalt therapy) as well as with decisions regarding whom to help. Some experts pushed for focus on normal developmental problems facing all students; however, others believed the counselors should assist with psychological problems of a needier minority of individuals (Aubrey, 1977). The influx of counseling methodologies also flooded the schools, and contributed to the fragmentation between guidance and counseling (Aubrey, 1982). These developmental growing pains continued into the next decade.

Federal legislation in the 1960’s greatly impacted the profession. In 1963 alone, there were amendments to the NDEA and the Elementary and Secondary Act, and the Vocational Education Act expanded and supported school counseling, guidance, and vocational education (Herr, 1985). Developments that began in the 1950’s in educational guidance resulted in a reduction in the ratio of students to school counselors from 1 to 960 in the late 1950’s, to 1 to 450 in 1966-1967 (Aubrey, 1982). Similarly, the Community Mental Health Systems Act deinstitutionalized individuals with mental illness, and sought to create a support network in the community rather than in state institutions (Herr, 1985). This move created community mental health agencies that worked from a team model, approaching care in a holistic fashion with mental health counselors, social workers, psychologists, and psychologists working together (Palmo, 1999).

In the 1970’s, counseling continued to struggle to find itself. In an effort to be all things to all persons, counselors’ professional responsibilities were widely scattered. Professionals began to express concern regarding the direction(s) in which the field was moving. For example, in a tongue and cheek article, Cross (1971) lamented the death of “Joe Personnel”. He described him as having “the devotion of James Conant, the enthusiasm and wit of Bob Hope, the knowledge of Don Super and Carl Rogers, and the compassion of Albert Schweitzer – in short, he must be Socrates, Christ, and Dear Abby rolled into one” (Cross, 1971, Abstract). Derald Wing Sue, an incoming editor to Personnel and Guidance,
wrote “we have become techniquey, gimmicky, and program-oriented without keeping in touch with
the broader educational, social, and psychological foundations and their implications for our work”
(1975, p. 19). Bradley (1978) reviewed concerns about counselor preparation, believing that program
graduates were torn between allegiances between the institution/agency and the client, and between a
preference for intrapsychic work and a focus on prevention and change in the client’s environment.
Bradley also asserted that counseling faculty may be undecided whether to train counselors for the jobs
in the present, or for a future not yet realized.

According to Aubrey (1983), the 1970’s were characterized by a fragmented society, high levels
of illiteracy and school drop-outs, decline in citizenship and morality, along with a rise in crime and
violence, and psychological reactions to the nuclear arms race. New federal legislations were put into
place addressing those with the greatest needs at the time. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 offered
continued support for rehabilitation counseling for persons with disabilities; the Educational
Amendments of 1976 (Title I, II, and III) continued supports for counseling and guidance in education;
the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1977 related to mainstreaming and individualized
education plans for students with learning disabilities; and the Comprehensive Employment and
Training Act of 1973 offered support for students at risk of dropping out, the unemployed, and those
who were economically disadvantaged (Herr, 1985). However, despite these strides amid the tough
political and economic climate of the time, public support of social services and education declined.
The impact of a fragmented professional identity and a lack of public support for counseling services
were felt across counseling fields, as discussed in Bradley (1978). For example, over 800 school
counseling jobs in New York were eliminated by the state board of education because counselors were
perceived as ineffective. Within the human services field, there was a growing sense of disenchantment
from all helping professions regarding diagnostic models based on psychopathology. In an influential
essay, Szasz (1960) argued that mental illness as a brain disease is myth, and instead should be
conceptualized as a problem of living in society. Bradley (1978) criticized Counselor Education models that focus on the individual clients “who have complete freedom to make their own decision” (p. 45) and further stressed that counselors who cannot see societal influences on their clientele will be ineffective in helping them.

During the 1980’s, identity issues continued to divide the profession. The guidance movement and school counseling were still struggling to find a framework for service delivery and a unified mission (Aubrey, 1982). Debates over licensure and/or certification further divided the profession (Watkins, 1981). Aubrey (1983) viewed the future of counseling with wariness, stating “Fairy tales . . . are a luxury for children, and the counseling profession is entering young adulthood” (p. 82). He believed that counseling had withdrawn from its social roots and was unprepared to meet the social needs of its clients.

Elmore (1985), president of ACES in 1982, described the counseling profession as “in a period of transition and crisis” (p. 414). Wrenn (1983) also believed the counseling profession was in a period of crisis and urged counselors to take a risk, be conscious of the changes in the world, and concern themselves with social issues. Aubrey wrote in 1983 that counseling was facing the worst of times and the best of times. In the face of dismal economic times, Aubrey was also encouraged by the profession: “Never before has the profession had so much strength in terms of numbers, resources, and know-how” (p. 80). On the other hand, the counseling profession continued to struggle with its professional identity. Pate (1980) encouraged counselors to acknowledge the contributions of other professions but to recognize counseling’s own valuable contribution to clients. He described counseling’s unique value as its focus on development and prevention, humanist foundation in research and practice, emphasis on work and education, and realistic approach to helping clients make hard decisions and dealing with the paperwork of life.
To professionalize the field, several changes were needed to assist with the transformation. In 1983, APGA changed its name to the American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD) to better reflect the professional identity of those it represents. Herr (1985) described the reason for the name change:

The rationales for such modifications were several, but the overriding issue was that the term guidance was essentially used only in elementary and secondary school settings and was becoming an archaic and vague term even there. Although such a perception of the term guidance is questionable, the primary argument for the name change was that association members were increasingly being found in settings other than education and that what these persons did was counseling, not guidance. (p. 395).

In an effort to increase the professionalism of counseling, many voices pushed for accreditation, credentialing, and licensure. One option was certification, which regulates an occupation based on the title used by the professional (e.g., counselor, psychologist; Sweeney & Witmer, 1977). Certification authorizes the use of a title and can be awarded by government bodies or volunteer agencies who review transcripts for evidence of meeting the standards of the profession (Forester, 1977). It is a voluntary process that attests that an individual has met “reasonable standards of education, experience, and expertise” (T. W. Davis, 1981, p. 85) and can represent him or herself as a qualified professional. In contrast, licensure impacts the both the practice and the title of the occupation through governmental regulation and oversight (Sweeney & Witmer, 1977). Those who violate licensure law (e.g., practicing the profession without a license to do so) can be subject to greater legal consequences (Forester, 1977). Licensure assists with the maintenance of the professional ethics, competence, and behaviors of its members (Arbuckle, 1977). The process of establishing counseling as a profession via social regulation proved to be divisive.
In the Land of Help, an allegory about the licensure debate, Watkins (1981) illustrated the divisive issue of licensure on the counseling profession. The allegory follows: Most counselors living in the House of PGA believed a counselor must climb the Master’s Mountain. However, others believed in addition to that, “the would-be counselor must recount orally and in written form the trials and tribulations suffered and experienced while climbing the mountain” and further it was “suggested that this process be written on the stone tablet in the Land of Law” (p. 182). Some disagreed with this suggestion, believing they were doing just fine on their own without having others tell them what to do. The allegory above reflects a real debate between counselors in the 1970’s. Some believed that the future of the profession was at stake if licensure was not achieved. Others believed that by legislating the profession, the public would be denied necessary services due to limitations on the number of people who could be helpers (T. W. Davis, 1981; Lindenburg, 1976). Among those professionally identifying as Counselor Educators, there was also a divide. In a study of approximately 1,500 ACES members, over 85% were in favor of establishing licensure for professionals trained outside of psychology programs (Carroll, Griggs, & Halligan, 1977). However, the respondents were at odds as to whether a doctoral degree was the minimum educational level sufficient for private practice, as was the standard in psychology. About 46% indicated the master’s level was adequate, while nearly 42% believed doctoral training was needed (Carroll et al., 1977).

In the 1970’s counselors in greater numbers sought employment in the community alongside psychologists and social workers; however, with the possibility of national health insurance seemingly in the near future, psychologists began to tighten their reign on so-called “psychological services” (Forster, 1977). Consequently, psychology’s legislation threatened counselors with possible fines or imprisonment for providing counseling services that overlap with psychological services. For example, some psychology state boards took legal action against individuals who were accused of practicing “psychology” without a license, although the individuals were not calling themselves psychologists.

School counselor credentialing was also a concern. Attempts by the American School Counseling Association (ASCA) in the 1960’s to define the role of the school counselor had little impact on the work performed by school counselors or on administrators’ expectations (Arbuckle, 1977). Lindenburg (1976) wrote a narrative about a school counselor in the future (1985) threatened with the loss of his job due to the lack of proper credentialing. Lindenburg predicted federal legislation requiring individuals who provide mental health services to be members of “bona fide” professional organizations, the fall of APGA, continued legal cases and eventual losses for counselors without credentials, and the demise of the counseling profession. This cautionary tale depicted the dangers of the counseling profession’s moving forward with professionalizing the field.

Herr (1985) described the push toward certification thusly: “there exists a body of knowledge, which must be learned by professional counselors to provide maximally effective counseling services” (p. 399). However, T. W. Davis (1981) asserted that:

Licensure may be doubly appealing to counselors, then, because it seems to furnish an objective positive personal identification (‘I am a member of a legally recognized, and therefore valuable, group in our society’). There is reflected public agreement that a licensed person must possess unusual, scarce skills to qualify for licensure (p. 84).

T. W. Davis believed that national certification was a better alternative, achieved through examination and competence assessments. Counselors could voluntarily seek certification, and it would not restrict the scope of practice of those who chose not to voluntarily seek certification. In 1983, the National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC) was formed to review credentials and administer examinations to
achieve national certification (Herr, 1985). However, national certification was just one part of the professionalization of the field.

Counselor licensure is intended to legally define and regulate the practice of counseling within individual states. While some professionals perceived licensure as essential to the growth and vitality of the profession (Edgar & Davis, 1983; Lindenburg, 1976), others saw licensure as an opportunity to also define what a counselor is and does, and to unite and mobilize the profession (Carroll et al., 1977; Sweeney & Witmer, 1977). Licensure was viewed by others as an opportunity to define counselors as those who treat social needs other professions tend not to address (e.g., mid-life career counseling); to provide services to more people at reduced costs to the public; and to protect the public from those with questionable practices (Sweeney & Witmer, 1977). Edgar and Davis (1983) suggested that among the compelling reasons for licensure included the lack of recourse for a client harmed by inappropriate behavior by a person publicly labeled as a “counselor”. Clients receiving questionable services from individuals using the term “counselor” may not have legal recourse because the “counselor” is not necessary committed to professional ethics of the profession.

As the debate continued throughout the 1970’s, it became clear to most parties that licensure was inevitable (Arbuckle, 1977). In a 1978 survey of 202 counselors and psychologists, both groups favored licensure for counselors (90% of sample) and more than half preferred separate licensure for each profession (53%; with 25% being unsure). However, the groups differed as to the minimal educational requirements (Snow, 1981). Each group preferred ideal academic levels similar to their own: doctoral level participants preferred the doctorate while master’s level participants believed the minimal level could be the master’s degree. These results mirror those reported by the larger ACES study (Carroll et al., 1977). In 1975, the APGA formally endorsed the counselor licensure issue and established a license commission (Swanson, 1981). In the late 1970’s, 20 states indicated interest in
legislature for credentialing counselors, but Virginia was the first state to do so, followed by Texas, Arkansas, and Alabama (Swanson, 1981; Sweeney & Witmer, 1977).

In the push to professionalize Counselor Education, the final step was to establish a set of standards for counselor preparation. In 1972, an ACES committee developed a set of standards for counselor preparation programs that was adopted by the boards of ACES, ASCA, and APGA (Stripling, 1978). In 1977, ACES membership approved doctoral standards (Stripling, 1978). However, APGA faced a problem: Who should accredit counseling programs? The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was currently the accrediting body for Counselor Education programs preparing elementary and high school personnel (Stripling, 1978). NCATE recognized the legitimacy of these standards for counselor preparation and agreed to use the 1973 standards rather than their own teacher education standards, which had been previously used to evaluate counseling programs (Elmore, 1985). The American Psychological Association (APA) was approached for accreditation of master’s level counseling programs; however, APA was unwilling to recognize master’s level practitioners for licensure (Elmore, 1985).

In September 1981, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) met for the first time (Gladding, 2009). CACREP, developed by APGA and its divisions, was formed to be an independent not-for-profit organization to accredited counseling and related programs (CACREP, 1982). CACREP earned its recognition by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) in April of 1987, after working closely with NCATE and participating in their accreditation procedures (Sweeney, 1992). This official endorsement earned CACREP respect on college and university campuses.

Professional identity issues have been paramount throughout the development of the profession over the last 30 years. From roots in several other areas (e.g., education, social activism, and psychology), a distinct profession has emerged. In July 1991, AACD voted on another name change. The
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referendum sent and approved by association members changed the professional organization’s name to the American Counseling Association (ACA) and became effective in July following year (Sheeley, 2002). The mission statement of the new organization was “The mission of the association is to enhance human development throughout the life span and to promote the counseling profession” (Sheeley, 2002, p. 390).

Despite a new mission and name, the profession still struggled to agree on a common identity. Maples and Altekruse (1993) suggested that “counselors who are academics need to verify our identity as counselor educators and convey pride in our profession” (¶ 14). The identity of a Counselor Educator differs from that of a psychologist, in terms of “philosophy, curriculum, history, world view, and probably its practice” (Lanning, 1988, p. 297). Hanna and Bemak (1997) suggested that the search for a unique identity may be illusory and differences have been based more on politics than true differences. However, despite developing a professional organization, an ethical code, professional training standards, an accrediting body, and credentialing, some experts still believe that counselors lack a collective identity (Gale & Austin, 2003). Those who identify as counselors may belong to alternative professional organizations, be licensed as something other than a professional counselor, and may also face different requirements for practice according to the state (e.g., some states require school counselors to have a teaching license and others do not). Nevertheless, the profession continues to grow and evolve to meet the needs of the global community.

The current state of Counselor Education. As a profession, Counselor Education continues to maintain a commitment to healthy human development, recognizing the diverse challenges that individuals face today. The pioneering members of the profession described themselves as social advocates, and today the role of a counselor as an advocate is embedded in our identity, and our ethical code of conduct (ACA, 2005). Since the early 1990’s, wellness has been promoted as a model for the counseling field (e.g., Myers, 1991). This emphasis on wellness is now included in the professional
training standards by CACREP (2009). Competencies with trauma and crisis have also been included in
the training standards, reflecting a response to the needs of communities after disasters such as the
2001 terrorist attacks or Hurricane Katrina. Managed care is an additional concern for the profession
(Gladding, 2009). Managed care has increased accountability and quality of services, but has also
limited the availability of services and often does not recognize counselors as providers or compensate
adequately for their services. Lastly, with increases in Internet usage, the use of technology in
counseling has grown (Shaw & Shaw, 2006). The ACA Code of Ethics (2005) has issued
recommendations for use in online counseling. Despite concerns about its usage, online counseling can
be beneficial for many individuals who are isolated geographically, those who are more comfortable
with the written format, those who might not otherwise have sought counseling, and those who are
unable to leave their homes due to physical disabilities or serious illness (Shaw & Shaw, 2006).
Counselor Educators have the responsibility to remain current in the trends facing their students to
ensure that they are prepared to face the needs of their clients and students.

In summary, the counseling field has grown significantly over the last one hundred years, with
many important advances in its establishment as a profession in the last 30 years. The profession has
defined itself as a field apart from its sister professions (i.e., psychology and education), and found
strength in its unique curriculum. Professional counselors describe their professional identities today as
grounded in wellness, prevention, and human development (Mellin, Hunt, & Nichols, 2011). The
profession has a social justice and advocacy focus and encourages counselors to work at the macro level
to be agents of change (Lee & Rodgers, 2009). The 20/20: A Vision for the Future of Counseling initiative
has been created and voted upon by delegates from the major stakeholders in the counseling profession
(e.g., American Counseling Association, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, American
School Counseling Association) with the purpose of advancing the profession (Kaplan & Gladding, 2011).
The challenges facing the advancement of Counselor Education have not changed significantly. Issues of
professional concern include strengthening the professional identity, improving public recognition, and promoting advocacy efforts as priorities; however, for the first time the profession has united to embrace a common vision (Kaplan & Gladding, 2011).

**Structure and function of Counselor Education programs.** Counseling programs are often housed in departments within colleges of education, reflecting their historical origins, and place a greater emphasis on human development and prevention than deficit or medical models of treatment (Vacc, 1991). Counselor Education programs prepare master’s level professionals to work in schools, the community, and higher education (Vacc, 1991). Programs also prepare doctoral students to work in academia or in leadership positions within the profession (J. D. West, Bubenzer, Brooks, & Hackney, 1995). Doctoral training of Counselor Educators differs in a myriad of ways from that of other ostensibly similar training programs (e.g., counseling psychology). The doctoral degree in Counselor Education and Supervision is the terminal degree in the field (CACREP, 2009) and provides graduates with advanced skills in clinical practice, supervision, research and professional scholarship, leadership, and teaching (Altekruse, 1991; J. D. West et al., 1995; Zimpher, Cox, West, Bubenzer, & Brooks, 1997). Graduates earn a doctorate of philosophy (Ph.D.) or doctorate of education (Ed.D.) in Counselor Education (Goodrich, Shin, & Smith, 2011). Upon graduation, students commonly seek employment as faculty members in Counselor Education programs.

Faculty responsibilities can vary widely between universities, but most programs emphasize varying combinations of scholarship, teaching, and service (T. E. Davis et al., 2006). Beyond the traditional expectations of teaching, scholarship, and service, Counselor Educators advise and mentor students, provide clinical supervision, participate and lead community engagement projects, and serve as leaders in counseling professional organizations. Some of this variety reflects faculty members’ autonomy to do work they find meaningful. In some positions, faculty have some degree of independence to do work congruent with personal and professional goals. Harmony in the person-
environment fit can enhance the sense of meaning that faculty experience in their work and organizational commitment (Lindholm, 2003), as well as involvement in work activities (Siegall & McDonald, 2004). For example, in a study of faculty physicians, those who spent at least 20% of their time doing the work they found most meaningful had half the rate of burnout compared to those who spend less time on meaningful activities (Shanafelt et al., 2009). Siegall and McDonald (2004) found that university faculty whose values conflicted with those of their university setting had higher burnout scores, spent less time on work activities, and reported greater intention to leave their positions.

Research emphasis differs among programs and between universities. Some universities have a strong research identity, whereas others focus more on teaching. Faculty in Counselor Education programs can teach at the undergraduate and graduate level. Service tends to be less highly valued in terms of promotion and tenure criteria; however, individuals may place higher value on service depending on their own professional identity. Fulfilling scholarship, teaching, and service expectations can be both challenging and rewarding depending on the expectations of the university and the interests of the individual.

Higher education differs from other educational environments in many ways. Instructors in higher education are evaluated based on teaching, scholarship, and service (T. E. Davis et al., 2006), whereas teachers in elementary and high school are evaluated primarily on student achievement (Farber, 2000). Sources of work-related stress also vary for instructors teaching at different levels. Student attitudes and behavior, student discipline problems, and parental expectations are significant stressors for teachers at the elementary, secondary, and intermediate levels; however, these factors were ranked lower or not at all by university faculty (Byrne, 1991). Multiple studies suggest that the most frequently indicated work-related stresses are related to workload, time constraints, and balancing multiple roles (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Doyle & Hind, 1998; Gmelch et al., 1984; J. M. Hogan, Carlson, & Dua, 2002).
Scholarship. Although scholarship is a defining activity for those who achieve doctoral training, it is also one of the largest sources of stress (Abouserie, 1996; Byrne, 1991). Scholarship provides a vehicle to transmit theoretical and empirical information to those inside and outside the profession. Additionally, research productivity in higher education is often measured by the number and type of publications (Townsend & Rosser, 2007). Depending on the institution, scholarship can include publication in peer-reviewed journals, publication of books and book chapters, presenting at conferences, providing workshops and trainings, offering consultation, participating in other speaking engagements, grant writing, creating online materials, and reviewing other materials or agencies (Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008). The admonition to “publish or perish” is increasingly prevalent in many universities. The pressure to publish may encompass a variety of stressors, such as a lack of control over the publication process (in comparison to control one has in teaching and service; T. E. Davis et al., 2006), anxiety and/or dislike for statistics and research (Perepiczka, Chandler, & Becerr, 2011), and pressure from the university (Byrne, 1991). These diverse stressors produce a level of anxiety and pressure to publish that for some faculty may be counterproductive to productivity (Magnuson, 2002). Yet, although the pressure to publish and associated stress can be overwhelming for some, developing and disseminating evidence-based practice for use by the helping professions is emphasized in Counselor Education.

In addition to career advancement expectations involving research, the counseling profession recognizes the need for Counselor Educators to be proficient researchers so that they can design counseling and education strategies that are maximally effective (Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008; ACA, 2005). For Counselor Education programs to produce effective researchers, mentorship in statistics and research methodology can be crucial. Indeed, faculty members are expected to serve as role models and mentors in research for graduate students (T. E. Davis et al., 2006), as well as for new faculty (Atieno Okech, Astramovich, Johnson, Hoskins, & Rubel, 2006; Magnuson, 2002). Research mentorship can be
either relational (e.g., support and role modeling) or instructional (e.g., assistance with research design or data analysis) and can contribute to occupational wellness (Briggs & Pehrsson, 2008). However, according to a recent study examining doctoral-level research training in Counselor Education, more research mentorship is needed both at the doctoral and new faculty levels (Atieno Okech et al., 2006). This lack of mentorship reportedly resulted in this study’s participants admitting to “shying away from research until they realize the necessity of research productivity in the tenure process” (p. 142).

Without clear mentorship to provide foresight and insight into the professional relevance of scholarship, new faculty find themselves attempting to meet vague and unclear publication expectations in tenure-track environments, overwhelmed by their lack of control over the publication process and an inadequate command of research and statistical methods. These stressors are distinct to scholarship and are of a different nature than those associated with teaching and service.

**Teaching.** Although scholarship often takes priority at many universities, teaching is generally considered a primary role, and certainly can be a demanding activity. Faculty are expected to teach anywhere from one to four classes per semester depending on type of university (e.g., research intensive or teaching) and other job-related responsibilities (e.g., course releases for serving as clinical director). Teaching can be time-intensive, especially for new faculty, in part because of time required to create or redevelop courses (Magnuson, 2002). Time spent engaged in teaching activities did not vary statistically in a study of CACREP liaisons among assistant, associate, and full professors; however, assistant faculty did spend significantly more time on teaching than on research and service (T. E. Davis et al., 2006). New faculty may feel pressured to address immediate teaching concerns and, consequently, struggle to give adequate attention to long-term research demands (N. R. Hill, 2004).

Faculty in Counselor Education programs can expect to teach a diverse student body with varying levels of experience in the helping field. Undergraduate human services degrees exist at some universities, but Counselor Education simply requires a baccalaureate degree for admission (Schweiger,
Henderson, & Clawson, 2008). Programs accept students with a variety of similar mental health degrees (e.g., psychology and social work) but also with undergraduate degrees from other disciplines such as business, accounting, and computer science. Counselor Education faculty in some programs may teach only graduate students, some already possessing experience in human services work (especially in doctoral programs), and in other programs they may teach undergraduate human services courses as well as graduate counseling courses. Counselor Education programs train professional counselors to work in a variety of settings, and therefore faculty are typically required to provide supervision to students in practicum and/or internship, teach both service (skill-building) courses as well as counseling content-specific courses, and provide advising and mentoring (Lanning, 1990).

At some universities and in programs, teaching competence is treated as less valuable in terms of tenure and promotion than scholarship. The quality of teaching expected as a minimum requirement for maintaining one’s job regardless university setting seems ambiguous. In a qualitative study of faculty, one faculty participant stated you will “never get tenure for being a good teacher, but you won’t get tenure without it” (Price & Cotton, 2006, p. 9). The importance can vary widely depending on institution. Some faculty experience anxiety associated with various aspects of the interpersonal experience of teaching, such as answering questions from students, disruptive behavior, and teaching evaluations (Gardner & Leak, 1994; Magnuson, Shaw, Tubin, & Norem, 2004). On the other hand, many faculty members report that teaching is one of the most rewarding aspects of their job (Magnuson, 2002). Often faculty experience little in terms of feedback on other areas of their academic career (N. R. Hill, 2004), whereas witnessing the growth and development of graduate students into counseling professionals can be immensely satisfying (Magnuson, 2002). By definition, faculty engage in teaching as a central part of their role definition in Counselor Education and excellence is expected across universities. Level of involvement in service; however, is more likely to be a function of personal discretion on the part of the individual faculty member.
Service. Faculty tend to have a high degree of flexibility in how they spend their time, in terms both of number of hours worked and amount of time allotted to their job responsibilities (Siegall & McDonald, 2004). The professional identity of the faculty member may influence the level of involvement in service activities (Calley & Hawley, 2008). Service often consists of serving on departmental and/or university committees (Price & Cotton, 2006) and/or administrative activities in the counseling field ranging from service on committees or leadership to the organization Gibson, Dollarhide, & McClallan, 2010). Additionally, faculty may collaborate with local neighborhood members to bring about change in their community (Lopez-Baez & Paylo, 2009). According to Boyer (1990), “Colleges and universities have recently rejected service as serious scholarship, partly because its meaning is so vague and often disconnected from serious intellectual work” (p. 22).

Some faculty members report highly valuing the service components of their career. As faculty achieve promotion and tenure and advance in their careers, personal values may increase participation in service activities (T. E. Davis et al., 2006). In a phenomenological study of non-tenured individuals who had served as American Counseling Association division presidents or president-elects, several participants reported greater emphasis on service in their program by their faculty. “[O]ne participant explained that service was ‘highly valued and just a part of what you do as a counselor educator.’ Another participant agreed with this belief: ‘The climate of the department really perpetuated service in my opinion’” (Gibson et al., 2010, p. 287; italics in original). Participants in the study reported that mentors during their doctoral study prompted their involvement, and others viewed service as valuable in shaping their professional career despite the lack of value placed on service by their employers.

In summary, the professional responsibilities of faculty in higher education vary depending on the institution and the individual. In Counselor Education programs, beyond scholarship, teaching, and service, faculty are often expected to serve in a variety of functions unique to the profession. Despite many administrative tasks, Counselor Educators also interact as educators, mentors, supervisors, and
consultants to counselors-in-training as well as counselors already practicing. Faculty are role models to others early in the profession, which is why it is exceptionally important for faculty to practice self-care and advocate for changes within the work environment to improve occupational well-being when possible.

**Counselor Education faculty occupational wellness.** Counselor Education faculty, like others in higher education, try to balance the demands of their multiple professional and personal roles. The meaningfulness of each activity varies among faculty and the amount of time spent on each differs. New faculty in higher education are expected to fulfill these roles adequately, as defined by the university, to achieve tenure and promotion; however, many experience frustration regarding convoluted expectations for reaching this goal (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000). The lack of clarity can result in role overload for new faculty (T. E. Davis et al., 2006; N. R. Hill, 2004). Strain can also arise from managing the interaction between home and work roles (Lease, 1999). Female faculty in higher education often report lower levels of job satisfaction overall, perceive greater inequities in treatment than male faculty, are often paid less, and less frequently gain promotion and tenure than men do (Hagedorn, 1996; N. R. Hill et al., 2005; Seifert & Umbach, 2008). However, N. R. Hill and colleagues’ (2005) study suggested that, at that time, an overall high level of current and long-term well-being existed for female Counselor Educators. Additionally, positive relationships and support were most encouraging to female Counselor Educators, whereas negative relationships and a toxic relational context contributed to dissatisfaction for participating faculty. The study had a low number of ethnic minority participants and N. R. Hill et al. cautioned that their results might not generalize to other female Counselor Education faculty who are also ethnic minorities.

Overall, most studies in higher education literature find that minority faculty report lower levels of job satisfaction (Laden & Hagehorn, 2000; Niemann & Dovidio, 1998; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). In Counselor Education, despite the profession’s having a stated commitment to diversity in the ACA Code
of Ethics (2005) and encouragement from CACREP (2009) Standards to programs to recruit and retain ethnic minority faculty, minority faculty are underrepresented in the profession (Bradley & Halcomb-McCoy, 2002). In a recent study of African American Counselor Educators, participants were generally satisfied with their jobs; however, satisfaction was significantly related to their perception of the department’s racial climate (Holcomb-McCoy & Brandley, 2005). Female faculty who are also minorities may experience difficulties due to being both female and members of an ethnic minority. In Bradley and Halcomb-McCoy’s (2004) study of African American Counselor Educators, 49 Counselor Educators from 125 CACREP-accredited programs (79% return rate) reported stress associated with research and publication, typical for most faculty members; however, female African American participants (approximately 50% of the sample) reported greater stress resulting from sexism by colleagues and students, and regarding the review and promotion process.

Mentorship and a positive supportive environment may be able to ameliorate stress and retain faculty, especially minority faculty members (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; Holcomb-McCoy, 2003). Several researchers have investigated the experiences of junior faculty within the first years of employment as Counselor Education faculty members in a longitudinal qualitative study (Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001). Within the first year of employment, participants reported high levels of both satisfaction and stress, mediated by a sense of connectedness. Mentoring can increase the satisfaction of new faculty members (Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001) and be crucial in success for tenure and promotion (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004; N. R. Hill et al., 2005).

Mentoring can assist faculty who are struggling with various aspects of their new career (Borders, Young, Wester, Murray, Villaba, Lewis, & Mobbley, 2011), but can be especially helpful with scholarship (Atieno Okech et al., 2006; Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996). Both career and psychosocial mentoring can greatly benefit the mentee and mentor alike (Borders et al., 2011). In the six year follow-up in their longitudinal study (Magnuson, Norem, & Lonneman-Doroff, 2009), participants advised
Counselor Education faculty applicants to seek a position that is a good fit in terms of climate, mentorship and support, and professional expectations.

**Importance of fit in higher education.** The particulars for a good fit will differ among individuals; however, one will be most satisfied with a position in which he or she finds a satisfactory person-environment fit. When individuals feel that they do not “fit” in their workplace, the likelihood for burnout and eventual turnover is greater (Lackritz, 2004; Lindholm, 2003; Reybold; 2005; Rosser, 2004). Person-environment fit can be measured in numerous ways. In the burnout literature, Maslach and Leiter (1997) describe the organizational context using six dimensions of worklife: (a) community, (b) control, (c) fairness, (d) reward, (e) workload, and (f) values. These six areas represent possible areas of mismatch in a work environment.

In a study examining the job search process for the 1999 cohort of new faculty (Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001), respondents’ answers can be categorized according to the six areas of worklife. Considerations such as compatibility with faculty and enthusiasm about the new faculty member (community), philosophical similarities (values), and academic freedom and autonomy (control) were listed as important when accepting a faculty position. Participants also identified characteristics about the university itself as crucial, with some individuals seeking a teaching school over a more research-intensive setting or vice versa. Some of the Counselor Educators in the study addressed the interaction between work and home roles, and one mentioned working a 14-hour day and still not being done for the day (workload). Following up with the original job seekers three years later, Magnuson and colleagues (2006) found that four of the original 49 participants had left the profession of Counselor Education. Reasons for leaving also revolved around these considerations of fit. Participants reported problems such as issues with connecting with faculty and a lack of support (community), disagreements with professional philosophies and ethics (values), and expectations for tenure and promotion (fairness). These experiences echo other research on job satisfaction and stress in Counselor Education (N. R. Hill,
The factors that lead to job satisfaction and organizational commitment and how individuals perceive their overall fit within the environment are highly individualized and may vary depending on demographic difference such as gender, race, tenure status and other elements. It is these same factors that play a role in leaving one’s position within an organization.

**Turnover Intention**

Much research has been done to gain insight into the reasons employees choose to leave organizations, which has been generally labeled turnover intention (Mobley, 1982). Research focuses on the intent to leave, rather than on actual turnover, because of the difficulty researchers have in locating individuals who have left an organization and because response rates to surveys are low when those who have left an organization (Johnsrud, Heck, & Rosser, 2000). Research has suggested that intent to leave is a good predictor of employees actually leaving positions (Bluedorn, 1982; Lee & Mowday, 1987; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Faculty turnover can be voluntary or involuntary, and demographic and professional characteristics, as well as environmental factors (perceived or actual), can influence both voluntary and involuntary turnover.

**Theory of turnover intention.** Much like burnout, the evolution of the study of why employees leave their jobs has expanded from a focus on individual factors to embrace organizational variables as well (Johnsrud & Heck, 1994). A focus on both individual and organizational factors is crucial to understanding this construct. Person-environment theory can be applied to turnover intention, much as it has been applied in burnout research. There are four levels of environmental fit, which begin at the broadest level and gradually become more specific: personal-vocation, person-job, person-organization, and person-work group (Lindholm, 2003). The current study focused on the third level of fit, and explored the compatibility between the person and the particular organization (for this study, the university) in which Counselor Education faculty work. Greater job satisfaction and organizational
commitment result from matches between an individual and his or her work environment in personality, values, and norms (Gregory, Albritton, & Osmonbekov, 2010).

Commitment contributes positively to an organization. Organizational commitment is a loyalty to an employer representing a long-term dedication to the organization. In contrast, job satisfaction, a more transitory concept, describes the extent to which employees like their job (Marchiori & Henkin, 2004). Occupational commitment, on the other hand, is a psychological link between a worker and his or her occupation based on the worker’s affective reaction to the occupation (K. Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000). A worker’s occupation is defined as a line of work an individual does to earn money characterized by particular knowledge, skills, and responsibilities that can be differentiated from other occupations and which are transferrable between organizations (K. Lee et al., 2000). Employees with strong occupational commitment are more likely to direct their energies toward work with professional associations in their discipline, more likely to improve their professional skills, and more likely to engage in professional activities (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993; Meyer, Allen, & Topolnydky, 1998). Employees with high levels of occupational and organization commitment are more likely to produce higher performance ratings (Baugh & Roberts, 1994). Occupational commitment is negatively correlated with occupational turnover intention, organizational turnover intention, and actual organizational turnover (K. Lee et al., 2000). Additionally, occupational commitment has been found to be negatively correlated with burnout and positively related to job satisfaction (K. Lee et al., 2000). Therefore, increased commitment to the position will benefit the individual, as well as the organization.

Early in the burnout literature, Karger (1981) described burnout as the alienation of the worker. Karger also suggested that for those who choose to stay in a position, job turnover itself may not be indicative of the occurrence or intensity of burnout. Some people may choose to stay in their position despite high burnout levels. The three dimensions of burnout may have differing impacts on whether an individual chooses to leave a job. In a survey of child protective services workers, Drake and Yadam
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(1996) found that emotional exhaustion, but not depersonalization, was predictive of job exit. However, depersonalization did have negative effects on the quality of services; although workers did choose to stay in their jobs, their provision of service suffered. When the individual no longer feels committed to or rewarded by the organization for which he or she works (or the occupation of which they are a part), that individual may seek a better fit elsewhere. In higher education, a faculty member can pursue a position in another department or college, a different institution, outside academia, or retirement (Clery & Lee, 2001).

Factors influencing turnover intention. Reasons for remaining in a position and reasons for leaving are related to many personal and organizational factors. Cotton and Tuttle (1986) found that female employees are more likely to leave than male employees, older employees or those who have been with the employer longer are less likely to leave, and married employees are slightly less likely to leave than single employees. The researchers note that gender effects are greater in professional jobs than in non-professional jobs. Few studies include race; however, it appears that minority employees have a higher level of turnover (Holtom, Mitchell, Lee, & Eberly, 2008). Voluntary turnover can be attributed to several basic reasons (Branham, 2005): (a) low pay and lack of recognition, (b) unfulfilling or meaningless work, (c) few opportunities for advancement, (d) poor management or supervisory practices, (e) untrustworthy leadership, and (f) dysfunctional culture in the workplace. Turnover in higher education appears to follow similar patterns.

Turnover intention in higher education. Faculty turnover can be voluntary or involuntary. Xu (2008) stated, “It is clear that voluntary turnover is a responsible decision that an individual faculty member undertakes when s/he perceives the work environment as persistently dissatisfactory with respect to one’s specific personal and professional needs and expectations” (p. 42; italics in original). Research has found that some faculty perceive that their quality of work life has declined (Johnsrud & Heck, 1998) and faculty have had to learn to balance the pressures of teaching, research, and service
with fewer resources (Wharton, Potter, & Parry, 2004). When faculty members are dissatisfied with their positions, teaching effectiveness, research productivity, and collegiality can suffer (Reybold, 2005). This dissatisfaction can also result in incivility and aggression toward students and colleagues. Dissatisfaction may also speed up retirement for some. Retirement is predicted to increase in the next decade (Gappa et al., 2007). However, faculty are more likely to leave their positions for reasons other than retirement (Clery & Lee, 2001) and those reasons tend to be more concerning (Xu, 2008) than retirement or involuntary exits, due to the monetary consequences for the institution and department.

Tenure status and turnover intention. Many factors go into the process of voluntary turnover in academia. Sources of job stress and job satisfaction can differ depending on tenure status and seniority has an inverse relationship with turnover intention. Turnover at the assistant professor level could be voluntary or involuntary (e.g., choosing to leave organization/occupation or being denied tenure), whereas turnover at the associate and full level is typically voluntary (Ehrenberg, Kasper, & Rees, 1990). Full professors more often leave a position to move toward other jobs at another university or for retirement. Salary has been found to play a role in the turnover intention of assistant and associate professors, but not for full professors, who are typically older and may have other reasons to stay (Ehrenberg et al., 1990). Barnes and colleagues (1998) did not find satisfaction with salary predictive of intent to leave academia, although other studies have found salary satisfaction to be predictive of pre-tenured individuals leaving positions (Smart, 1990; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Pre-tenured faculty are influenced to stay by factors such as job security, autonomy, and being at a robust university (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Hagedorn (1994) found that faculty early in their career (25 years or more from retirement) derived satisfaction from positive interactions between themselves and students and/or administration. For those mid-career (15 to 20 years from retirement), satisfaction was strongly related to compensation, whereas for those who were approaching retirement (five years or less), satisfaction was linked to both compensation and positive relationships with administration. This is in line with
Braskamp and Ory’s (1984) developmental approach to conceptualizing faculty career development. Assistant professors are typically concerned with advancement in the profession, associate professors focus on creating balance in their professional life, and full professors work to fulfill lifetime personal and professional goals.

**Gender, race, and turnover intention.** The demographics of the higher education workforce have changed significantly in the last century. Women now make up 38% of all full time faculty and 48% of part-time faculty. However, 44% of all new faculty are women (Gappa et al., 2007). Women, racial and ethnic minorities, dual-career families, and single parents (Gappa et al., 2007) are more prevalent in professional roles than they once were. Overall, research suggests that men and women experience different levels of career satisfaction in higher education, with men experiencing higher levels of satisfaction (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Sabharwal & Corley, 2009; Seifert & Umbach, 2008).

In an early study of occupational stress, Blix and colleagues (1994) found that 66% of women experienced feeling work related stress more than 50% of the time and were also more likely to change jobs. Sabharwal and Corley (2009) found that, across all disciplines in higher education, men had significantly more years of experience and higher incomes, and experienced higher job satisfaction. However, men and women in social sciences had similar levels of job satisfaction (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). Minority faculty also tend to report lower levels of job satisfaction (Niemann & Dovidio, 1998; Seifert & Umbach, 2008). Seifert and Umbach (2008) found that both female faculty and minority faculty perceived less equitable treatment than their male and Caucasian peers did. Overall, for most faculty members, job satisfaction is correlated strongly with external factors such as salary, job security, and other factors such as opportunities for advancement and better benefits (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004).

The relationships among demographic variables, such as gender, race, age, and other personal factors and turnover intention are varied. Smart (1990) found that tenured men had stronger turnover intentions than tenured women, but gender was not an important influence in pre-tenured faculty.
Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found a weak indirect link between gender and turnover. In their study, pre-tenured female faculty reported lower job satisfaction related to job security, and were more likely to leave their positions than tenured female faculty and male faculty. By contrast, other research has found that male faculty members and pre-tenured faculty members are more likely than female and tenured faculty to leave not just their position, but higher education in general (Barnes et al., 1998), while female full professors are more likely to leave their positions but not their occupations (Ehrenberg et al., 1990). Younger faculty members have a higher turnover rate (Sanderson, Phua, & Herda, 2000; Smart, 1990). Additionally, those with a longer career age (i.e., length of time within the profession versus at the institution) are more likely to stay (Smart, 1990; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004), which in academia tends to mean a greater salary than those with less experience. Sanderson and colleagues found that women and minorities tend to be delayed in the tenure and promotion process as compared to their male and white counterparts and some may leave before gaining tenure. Finally, faculty may also consider factors such as a spouse’s career or closeness to family when deciding to leave a position (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005). There are numerous variables in play when examining turnover in the academic professions and these demographic factors have a complicated interplay, which research has yet to fully explain.

**Organizational factors and turnover intention.** Turnover can be representative of substantial organizational problems, such as a negative organizational context (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Job satisfaction reflects congruence between the person and the work environment (Xu, 2008) and is negatively correlated with turnover intention. Studies of various faculty in multiple settings suggest that certain factors contribute to organization turnover, such as incongruity between personal and institutional values, dissatisfaction with salary, poor relationships with administration, lack of community, low job security, lack of research support or resources, tenure problems such lack of communication of expectations, low quality of life, work overload, and excessive time demands (Barnes...
et al., 1998; Conkin & Desselle, 2007; Heckert & Farabee, 2006; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Lindholm, 2003). However, different disciplines place differing importance on these factors (Xu, 2008). Conversely, factors that impact an individual to stay and which contribute to job satisfaction include a sense of collegiality or social/emotional support, autonomy, geographic location, fringe benefits, institutional fit, intellectual stimulation or engagement, resource availability, job security, reputation and/or ‘robustness’ of the university (Barnes et al., 1998, Conkin & Desselle, 2007; Lindholm, 2003, Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Nevertheless, when individuals feel that they do not “fit” in their workplace, the likelihood for burnout and eventual turnover is greater. Universities play a role in recruiting staff compatible with their missions, as well as in providing a work environment that retains good faculty.

Rapidly growing institutions often report lower retention rates (voluntary and involuntary) for assistant professors. This pattern may be attributable to recruiting poor matches during the hiring process, perhaps because of a pressing need for new staff (Ehrenberg et al., 1990). Despite the benefits new faculty can bring, such as restructuring lines of reporting or decision making, as well as innovation (Rosser, 2004; Xu, 2008), faculty turnover also has significant negative consequences for a university. Universities face a lack of return on the investment made in the departing individual, the cost in money and time of conducting a new faculty search, the necessity for reallocating teaching and research activities, and the disruption in mentoring and advising students (Ehrenberg, Kasper, & Rees, 1990; Rosser, 2004; Xu, 2008). For example, at research universities, research start-up packages can cost half a million dollars or more (Ehrenberg, Rizzo, & Jakubson, 2003), a significant expense for the university. Even with that investment, retention rates for more research-oriented universities tend to be lower, possibly due to the greater difficulty obtaining tenure at these universities (Ehrenberg et al., 1990).

Turnover intention is an important factor to study when investigating burnout and person-environment fit. Increased turnover intention in higher education has been attributed to some personal variables, such as being pre-tenured or a minority faculty member, and organization factors such as
salary, poor fit, and relationships with colleagues. Burnout impacts job satisfaction, which in turn can result in an employee leaving the organization or the profession altogether. However, some individuals experiencing burnout may be unable to leave their positions for personal or professional reasons. Lindholm asserted that “today, the prevailing concept is that work processes and outcomes can be explained best by the interaction of personal and situational factors, rather than by a general preponderance of one or the other” (2003, p. 127; italics in original). The six areas of worklife were developed from themes that emerged from years of burnout research, but also provide a conceptual framework to understand the person in context (Leiter & Maslach, 2003; Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Faculty who experience burnout can negatively affect not only the educational unit, but also the students who look to faculty as role models for self-care and personal wellness. Furthermore, burnout has also been found to be predictive for turnover (Leiter & Maslach, 2009), which represents a significant loss for both counseling programs and universities that invest a good deal in new faculty.

Summary

This literature review lends support for the research questions investigated in this study. In higher education, job expectations, commitment to professional responsibilities, and opportunities outside of academia differ across academic disciplines. This study concentrated solely on Counselor Educators to fill the research gap in organizational turnover intention and burnout specific to the Counselor Education profession. This study examined the person-environment fit of Counselor Education faculty and the relationship between fit and burnout. University expectations for new hires should be clearly defined and congruencies or incongruencies between the university’s expectations and the applicant’s career ambitions should be considered. However, the fit between a faculty member and their university may change over time for diverse reasons: altered expectations for faculty job performance because of financial pressures, for example, or changes in a faculty member’s priorities. Person-environment fit plays an important role in recruiting and retaining faculty. High levels of
burnout have been found to increase turnover intention. If a faculty member is dissatisfied with their university, he or she has the option to leave. Xu (2008) stated, “With transferable teaching and research skills, they seek to have an environment that best fits personal values and professional needs” (p. 59). This study sought to understand the relationship among person-environment fit, burnout, and turnover intention in a national sample of Counselor Educators.

Research Questions

This study utilized an organizational approach and the person – environment framework to examine burnout, issues of congruence, and turnover intention in Counselor Education faculty. Little to no research is available on faculty who educate master’s level and/or doctoral students in human services. Insight regarding the burnout phenomenon in this population is imperative. Therefore, assessing the level of burnout, exploring the person-environment fit, and examining the relationship between burnout and turnover intention in Counselor Education faculty, should help university administrators develop ways to support and retain university faculty.

Because little is known about this population and burnout, the initial research questions were exploratory, focusing on the population itself. The research questions were as follows: First, are there differences among (a) tenured and pre-tenured, (b) male and female, and (c) majority and minority group faculty in terms of burnout, turnover intention, and person – environment mismatches? Then, what relationships exist among and between the (d) dependent variables for this study, specifically: burnout (exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy), turnover intention, and person-environment match scores (community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload)? Finally, how do the burnout subscales predict (e) turnover? This data will provide a foundational basis for additional research in this area.
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Definition of Terms

*Burnout* – A psychological concept describing a prolonged response to chronic stressors on the job (Maslach, 1993). The syndrome consists of exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy occurring in otherwise psychologically healthy individuals (Leiter, Jackson et al., 2009).

*CACREP-accredited program* – A training program designated as being accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Programs that are CACREP-accredited demonstrate that the educational content and the quality of the program have been evaluated and meet the standards set by the specialized accreditation body for the counseling profession (CACREP, 2011).

*Community* – Social component to one’s work life which includes issues such as support, closeness, and ability to work as a team (Leiter & Maslach, 2004).

*Control* – One’s perceived ability to work autonomously, obtain needed resources, and independently make decisions that impact one’s work (Leiter & Maslach, 2004).

*Cynicism* – Lost enthusiasm and passion for the work once enjoyed where one may distance themselves from the individuals with which they work or the work they do and may become callous and apathetic (Leiter & Maslach, 2005; Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001; Maslach & Goldberg, 1998).

*Exhaustion* – Feelings of being emotionally and physically depleted and overextended at work (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998).

*Fairness* – The extent to which decisions are fair and employees are treated respectfully (Leiter, Maslach, 2004).

*Reduced personal accomplishment or professional inefficacy*– When one loses confidence in his or her competency, productivity, and self-efficacy in his or her work (Maslach & Goldberg, 1998; Leiter & Maslach, 2005).
Reward – Can be monetary, social, or intrinsic and ideally match the employee’s expectations (Leiter & Maslach, 2004). Lack of recognition, insufficient monetary compensation, or low intrinsic satisfaction can increase vulnerability to burnout.

Turnover intention – An individual employee’s intention to voluntarily leave an organization, which has been found to be an excellent predictor of actual turnover (Bluedorn, 1982).

Values – Ideals, meanings, and motivations that attracted an employee to the job (Leiter & Maslach, 2004).

Workload – Job demands that exceed one’s capabilities and result in feeling overloaded (Leiter, Maslach, 2004).

Manuscript Organization

This dissertation consists of four distinct chapters. The current chapter has introduced the reader to the statement of the problem, purpose of the study, the literature review, research questions, and definitions of terms. Chapter Two consists of the research design and the methodology that was followed for this study, including sampling procedures, instruments, and research procedures. Chapter Three contains the results of the data analysis. Finally, chapter Four is comprised of the discussion of the results, implications for the field, limitations of the study, and the recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II

Methods

The first chapter provided a review of the literature related to burnout, higher education, Counselor Education faculty, and turnover intention. This chapter presents a detailed description of the methods of this study, and addresses the population sampled, variables accessed, instruments used, method followed, and procedures utilized for data analysis. The chapter concludes with modifications made to the final study based on a low participant response rate.

Population and Sampling Method

Recruitment targeted counselor education faculty from CACREP-accredited programs in the United States. Non-CACREP-accredited programs were excluded from the study for a variety of reasons. Primarily, the 2009 CACREP standards assure that faculty teaching in CACREP-accredited programs are held to national standards which produce common expectations, such as involvement in counseling professional organizations, congruous educational credentials of faculty, and a clear professional identity as counselors (CACREP, 2009; Zimpher et al., 1997). Counselor Education programs were identified using the CACREP website listing of accredited programs. Three schools were excluded following identification due to my having personal relationships with nearly all core faculty members. Then university website information was used to obtain the contact information for all full-time core faculty. Programs that did not list program faculty or individual faculty members with missing or inaccurate contact information were excluded. Finally, I used a random number generator (Haahr, 2012) to randomly select participants to receive the electronic survey link. Because the selection was truly random, some participants would likely be selected more than once. Therefore, a sampling of 400 randomly selected potential participants was requested, resulting in a list of 358 unique names. Eight of these participants had inaccurate contact information and the survey was sent to the remaining 350
participants. To ensure a sample with adequate power, 112 participants were needed to have a medium effect (.80) at the .05 significance level.

### Variables and Instruments

This study used two instruments. The Maslach Burnout Inventory has been used to assess burnout for thirty years and is considered the “gold standard” in burnout research (Carson, Baumgartner, Matthews, & Tsoulous, 2010; Shanafelt, Bradley, Wipf, & Black, 2002; Schutte et al., 2000). The measure has acceptable levels of reliability and validity. I created the demographic questionnaire to examine demographic characteristics pertinent to the present study such as tenure status, gender, and ethnicity, and can be found in Appendix A. The demographic questionnaire also included questions to measure congruence between the individual and workplace environment based on the six areas of worklife (Leiter & Maslach, 2005). The questionnaire contains several questions assessing turnover intention. Additional information, including reliability and validity of the instruments and questions used in the study, are discussed below.

### The Maslach Burnout Inventory

The Maslach Burnout Inventory was first published nearly 30 years ago and is considered the leading measure of burnout (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996). In the present study, the Maslach Burnout Inventory- General Survey (MBI-GS) is used rather than the Maslach Burnout Inventory for Educators (ES). The first version of the MBI developed was the Human Service Survey (HSS; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Fitzpatrick, 2004). The educators’ survey was adapted from the HSS for use for those who work in school settings by replacing the term “recipient” used in the HSS with “student” (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996). The development of the MBI-GS has extended to those not involved specifically in “people work” (Maslach & Jackson, 1984, p. 136) and differs from both of its predecessors in a few important aspects (Schaufeli, 2003). First, it is shorter than the other two versions and has been reworded so not to refer directly to service recipients (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996). Second, rather than using the
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traditional three scales for emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment used in the MBI-HSS and MBI-ES (Fitzpatrick, 2004), it uses the generic terms of exhaustion, cynicism, and professional efficacy (Maslach, Leiter et al., 2008). Therefore, I chose the more general survey (MBI-GS), to capture data regarding Counselor Education faculty whose jobs duties may be predominantly administrative, such as department chairs. Leiter and colleagues (2009) stated that the MBI-GS is appropriate for those in all occupations, and therefore could be used for both faculty whose jobs are primarily administrative and those who mostly work with students.

The MBI-GS is a self-report inventory consisting of 16 questions asking how often an individual feels a certain way on a zero to six point Likert scale, with zero meaning “Never” and six meaning “Every Day” (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996). There are three subscales mirroring the three dimensions of burnout: exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy. The professional efficacy subscale is reverse-scored and has positively worded statements such as “In my opinion, I am good at my job” (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996). Exhaustion is measured by five questions, cynicism is measured by five questions, and inefficacy is measured by six questions (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996). There is no cross-over between subscales. Unlike the MBI-ES or HSS, the MBI-GS measures one’s relationship on a continuum between burnout and engagement (Maslach, Leiter et al., 2008). Burnout is considered a continuous variable and scores on the subscales on the MBI-GS can be low, moderate, or high (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996). A high burnout score generally results from high scores in exhaustion and cynicism and low scores in professional efficacy; however, the measure does not provide a cut-off score to distinguish between ‘no burnout’ and ‘burnout’ (Maslach, Leiter, et al., 2008). Therefore, scores on the cynicism dimension, for example, can be correlated with other variables, such as gender, to provide information about the sample, but are not diagnostic for the presence versus absence of burnout as a dichotomous variable could be. The subscale scores for each dimension of burnout cannot be combined to have one global burnout score (Maslach, Leiter et al., 2008).
To determine internal consistency reliability, the MBI-GS was given to respondents in North America, Holland, and Finland. Using Cronbach's alpha (C. Wright, 2005), similar patterns of scores emerged for exhaustion (.89, .87, and .87, respectively); cynicism (.80, .73, and .84, respectively), and professional efficacy (.76, .77, and .84, respectively). Scores on the exhaustion and cynicism scales (C. Wright, 2005) were positively correlated (.44 to .61, median of .48) and scores on the professional efficacy scale correlated negatively with both the exhaustion (-.04 to -.34, median of -.23) and cynicism scales (-.38 to -.57, median of .44).

Areas of Worklife

Maslach and Leiter (1997) proposed a model of burnout focusing on six areas of possible mismatch between the person and the job environment: community, control, fairness, reward, workload, and values. Maslach and Leiter also developed the Areas of Worklife Scale. The scale was not used in the present study because it requires an extremely high number of participants (approximately 800) to analyze using a path analysis. Instead, six questions were designed to reflect the content of each of the areas of worklife, consistent with the theoretical definitions in the theory (Leiter & Maslach, 2005). Participants rate their satisfaction with their fit on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (highly unsatisfactory) to 5 (highly satisfactory). These questions have face validity, in that they appear to measure the concepts they intend to measure.

Turnover Intention

Turnover intention was measured by three questions modified from Leiter and Maslach’s (2009) adaptation of a turnover intention measure (Kelloway, Gottlieb, & Barham, 1999). The questions are as follows: “I plan on leaving my current faculty position within the next year,” “I have been actively looking for other faculty positions,” and “I want to remain in my faculty position” (this last item was reverse coded). These three questions were rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questions have a high internal consistency (α = .82; Leiter & Maslach, 2009).
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2009); however, the slight modifications I made could impact the current internal consistency. Additional questions were used to clarify the nature of the turnover. Three other questions clarifying career development after leaving the present position were asked, but not included for analysis in this study.

Demographic Characteristics and Other Data

The demographic questionnaire was created for this study. This self-report measure addressed a variety of areas important to the experience of Counselor Educators based on the available research on faculty experiences. This questionnaire assessed a number of demographic characteristics of the participants such as age, ethnicity, gender, highest level of education, tenure status, number of classes taught and committees on which they serve, number of hours on the job, number of years as a Counselor Education faculty member in the current position and number of years in counselor education. The researcher also collected some data to be used in future research (not included in the analysis in this study).

Procedure

A listing of CACREP accredited programs across the United States was obtained. As of December 2011, there were 264 CACREP programs. The electronic survey study link was initially sent to 350 randomly selected full-time faculty members. Participants were contacted personally by email (rather than a bulk mailing or Listserv survey request; see Appendix B), and those who had not yet participated received a follow-up email approximately 10 days later to remind them to participate. Then, after approximately one week, I sent a final reminder. Participants were informed of their right to refuse to answer any questions that may be uncomfortable and the right to withdraw from the study at any time. Participants were informed that the study was investigating the perceptions that Counselor Education faculty had regarding their jobs in higher education. The procedure for keeping participants’ data anonymous is described below.
Data Collection and Analysis

I obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the university prior to conducting research. Due to the sensitive nature of the request (e.g., perceptions of job and intention to leave), I received permission from the IRB to waive the need for a signature on a consent form and to use an information sheet (Appendix C) instead to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. Completion of the survey signified their consent to participate in the research without providing their names or other identifying information. Data from the survey was stored in Transform, an online survey tool, maintained by Mind Garden, Inc., which is the publisher of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Participants logged into the Transform system with their names and email addresses; however, these identifiers were suppressed by the Transform system.

At the conclusion of data collection, I downloaded the raw data from the Transform system. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS; Windows 19 software) for data analysis. Descriptive statistics, assessing the dataset for missing data, and reliability analyses were run first. Then I ran analyses specific to my research questions.

The five research questions for this study were introduced in Chapter One. The research questions are listed below with the statistical analysis that was run:

a) Are there significant mean differences between pre-tenured and tenured counselor education faculty in exhaustion, cynicism, efficacy, turnover intention, and the six areas of worklife (community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload)? (MANOVA)

b) Are there significant mean differences between counselor education faculty who identify as male and counselor education faculty who identify as female in exhaustion, cynicism, efficacy, turnover intention, and the six areas of worklife (community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload)? (MANOVA)
c) Are there significant mean differences between counselor education faculty who identify as white and counselor education faculty who identify as non-white in exhaustion, cynicism, efficacy, turnover intention, and the six areas of worklife (community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload)? (MANOVA)

d) What are the relationships among and between all of the dependent variables collected for this study: exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy, six areas of worklife (community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload), and turnover intention? (Correlational analyses)

e) Which of the burnout subscales predict turnover intention? (Regression)

**Modifications**

I realized early in the data collection that it was necessary to increase the number of participants in the study to ensure adequate power in statistical analyses. After receiving permission from the IRB, I identified an additional 500 participants using random selection procedures described above. Due to the possibility that a participant could be selected more than once or had been selected in the earlier random selection, 800 random selections were requested. The survey was sent to the first 500 participants who had not been contacted earlier and had accurate contact information.

Additionally, a small mistake was made in the initial recruitment email, and participants were not identified individually by name (i.e., Dear Dr. John Smith), but as potential research participants. This error was caught before the second reminder email to the original 350 and remedied. The new participants also received two reminder emails to participate in the study after ten days and then again seven days after the second reminder. Lastly, a composite variable was created by collapsing the six questions regarding the areas of worklife together. This new score, measuring perceived worklife fit, was developed due to the small sample size.
Summary

Chapter Two described the various methodological approaches used to implement this study. Procedures for data collection, such as the random sampling design of the study, which included a targeted recruitment of counselor education faculty from CACREP-accredited programs in the United States, were presented. In addition to sampling methodology, Chapter Two described the assorted variables and instruments used within this study to examine issues related to burnout, including details related to the demographic questionnaire, the Maslach Burnout Inventory, and strategies for measuring Areas of Worklife and Turnover Intention. Surveys were sent to 850 randomly selected faculty and 74 completed surveys; however, ten of the surveys received did not meet study criteria and were not used (8% response rate). As previously mentioned, 112 participants were needed to achieve adequate power to have a medium effect at the .05 significance level. Implications related to response issues will be explored in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER III

Results

The current study was designed to assess the level of burnout in Counselor Education faculty teaching in Council for Accreditation and Related Programs (CACREP) accredited programs. The study also examined which aspects of the work experience related to Counselor Educators’ levels of burnout, perceived fit in their jobs, and intention to leave their workplace. This chapter contains the results of data analysis beginning with demographic details of the sample. Descriptive statistics are described related to study variables. Lastly, the analyses related to each of the five research questions are presented.

Participant Demographics

The participants in the sample were from a list of faculty in CACREP-accredited counseling programs (both master’s and doctoral) across the United States. They were randomly selected from a list of all possible participants and recruited via email. For the purpose of the study, participants who were part-time or adjunct faculty were excluded from the sample, as well those who were not identified as teaching in a CACREP-accredited program. The total number of possible participants was 1,840 and 850 received an invitation to complete the questionnaire. A total of 74 faculty participated in the study. There were very little missing data. Ten participants did not meet the parameters of the study and their data were not included in analyses. Based on the Cohen power analyses, 112 participants were required to detect a medium effect size; therefore, the sample size did not meet this criterion.

I collected demographic data, including age, gender, ethnicity, and highest level of education. I also collected information regarding the number of years in counselor education, number of years at particular university, primary role at university, and current tenure status (See Appendix A for full survey). A summary of this data appears in Table 1. The average age of participants was 49.37 years (SD = 10.38) and ages ranged from 30 to 68 years. Thirty-four of the participants identified as female (53%).
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The majority of participants were Caucasian (80% of sample); 11 percent were African American. All participants stated they worked in CACREP-accredited programs and 77% (n=49) had Ph.D. or Ed.D. degrees in Counselor Education and Supervision. Other participants reported having doctoral degrees in Psychology (3%), Counseling Psychology (8%) or other unspecified degrees. The majority of participants were program faculty (63%); however, other participants reported positions such as program coordinators, research faculty, and one identified as an administrator or chair. Faculty members had worked in Counselor Education for an average of 12 years, holding their current positions an average of 10 years. There were 22 pre-tenured professors and 42 tenured professors.
Table 1  
*Demographic Description of Sample of Counselor Education Faculty (N = 64)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS/M.Ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D./Ed.D in Counselor Education</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psy.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative position/ Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Faculty</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Program chair without course release</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-tenured</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics of Study

Ranges, means, and standard deviations for all subscales and scores used in the study are reported in Table 2. In terms of burnout assessed using the raw scores from the MBI-GS, the sample had a moderate exhaustion score ($\bar{x} = 11.47$), moderate cynicism score ($\bar{x} = 8.58$), and moderate professional efficacy score ($\bar{x} = 29.84$). Average ratings (total raw score divided by the total number of item within the scale) are shown in Table 2.

For person-environment fit, I created a composite variable by adding the six areas of worklife variables into one sum total score labeled hereafter as perceived worklife fit. The internal consistency ($\alpha$) of this composite measure was .86, and the item-total scale correlations ranged from .53 to .80 ($Mdn r = .64$). This decision reflected Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2001) recommendation to combine correlated independent variables into a composite index as a means of increasing statistical power in studies with smaller than expected sample sizes (see Appendix D for levels of satisfaction individual areas of worklife prior to being collapsed into a composite variable). Overall, perceived worklife fit average score was rated between tolerable and satisfactory ($\bar{x} = 3.54$).
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Internal Consistency (Alpha) Estimates for Sample on Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey, Turnover Intention Score, and Perceived Worklife Fit Score (N = 64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.2 – 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.0 – 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Efficacy</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>2.0 – 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.0 – 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Fit</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>8.0 – 30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Questions and Analyses

The first three research questions of this study were posed to understand the relationships among demographic characteristics of the sample and the dependent variables. A 2 x 2 x 2 multivariate analysis of variance was performed to evaluate whether combined scores on exhaustion, cynicism, professional efficacy, turnover intention, and perceived worklife fit varied as a function of gender (male or female), race (majority and minority) and tenure status (pre-tenured or tenured). Because there were very few minority participants (n = 13) they were collapsed into one category. Based on the Wilks’ criterion, there were statistically significant overall multivariate differences associated with gender \([F(5, 52) = 2.76, p = .03, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .21]\), but not race \([F(5, 52) = 1.45, p = .22, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .12]\) or tenure status \([F(5, 52) = 1.32, p = .27, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .11]\). Regarding interaction effects, there were no significant interactions between race and gender \([F(5, 52) = .91, p = .48, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .08]\), race and tenure status \([F(5, 52) = .39, p = .86, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .04]\), gender and tenure status \([F(5, 52) = 1.56, p = .19, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .13]\), or race, gender, and tenure status \([F(5, 52) = 1.01, p = .42, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .09]\). The power for these analyses was .78, .47, .43, .30, .14, .50, and .33 respectively.

In response to the significant association found between gender and the composite of the dependent variables, a series of ANOVAs were conducted to compare male and female respondents on the five dependent variables. None of these follow-up comparisons reached statistical significance: exhaustion \([F(1, 62) = .28, p = .60, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00]\), cynicism \([F(1, 62) = 2.11, p = .15, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .03]\), professional efficacy \([F(1, 62) = 1.31, p = .26, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02]\), turnover intention \([F(1, 62) = 1.34, p = .25, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .02]\), and perceived worklife fit \([F(1, 62) = .02, p = .90, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00]\). The power for these analyses was .04, .29, .20, .21, and .04 respectively. Therefore, there was a main effect for gender, but no significant univariate effects were found. There were no significant relationships among the demographic variables of gender, race, and tenure status and the dependent variables of burnout, turnover intention, and perceived worklife fit.
The fourth research question focused on examining the relationships among the dependent variables explored in the previous MANOVA analysis. A correlational analysis (Pearson Product Moment Correlations) was used to determine the relationships among and between all five dependent variables (exhaustion, cynicism, professional efficacy, turnover intention, and perceived worklife fit). As expected, statistically significant correlations exist between all study variables except for professional efficacy’s correlations with turnover intention and perceived worklife fit (See Table 3).
Table 3
*Correlations among Dependent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>3c</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cynicism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Professional Efficacy</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Turnover Intention</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived Worklife Fit</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01.
The final analysis, based on the fifth research question, evaluated how well the burnout subscales as a group predicted turnover. Because the construct of burnout is measured with three separate scales (exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced professional efficacy) that cannot be collapsed into a composite measure (Maslach, Leiter et al., 2008), regression analysis (forced-entry) was conducted to evaluate the extent to which of the burnout subscales predicted turnover intention. Altogether, the three burnout scales explained 23% of the variance in turnover intention \( F(3, 60) = 6.06, p < .01 \). The power for this analyses was .99. Concerning specific burnout subscales, only cynicism \( (\beta = .47, t = 2.78, sr^2 = .10, p < .01) \) was useful for predicting turnover intention, while scores on exhaustion \( (\beta = .03, t = .17, sr^2 = .00, p = .86) \) and professional efficacy \( (\beta = .01, t = .10, sr^2 = .00, p = .92) \) were not significant predictors. In summary, only cynicism predicted turnover intention in this sample of Counselor Education faculty. Lastly, table 4 depicts frequency data on several descriptive questions from the demographic survey.
Table 4

Responses to Other Items on the Demographic Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How many classes are you teaching per academic year?</th>
<th>5. How many hours do you estimate you spend on the job during the typical week?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 classes    6.3%</td>
<td>20-29 hours  4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 classes    12.5%</td>
<td>30-39 hours  10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 classes    10.9%</td>
<td>40-49 hours  28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 classes    25.0%</td>
<td>50-59 hours  36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 classes    12.5%</td>
<td>60-69 hours  14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 classes    6.3%</td>
<td>70-79 hours  1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 classes    9.4%</td>
<td>80 and up    1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 classes   6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 classes   4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 classes and up 6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. How many thesis committees do you serve as chair at this time?</th>
<th>6. How personally committed to your job do you feel you are as compared to other faculty in your program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 committees  76.6%</td>
<td>Much less  3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 committees  10.9%</td>
<td>About the same  56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 committees  3.1%</td>
<td>Much more  40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 committees  3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 committees and up 6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. How many dissertation committees do you serve as chair at this time?</th>
<th>7. How does your workload compare to other faculty in your department?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 committees  57.8%</td>
<td>Below average  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 committees  10.9%</td>
<td>Average  46.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 committees  7.8%</td>
<td>Above average  53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 committees  3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 committees  1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 committees  6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 committees  4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 committees  0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 committees  3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 committees  0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 committees  4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4. When you began your current position at your university was there a formal mentoring experience? | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Yes                                                                 37.5% | |
| No                                                                  62.5% | |
CHAPTER IV

Discussion

The previous chapter described the results of the present study examining the level of burnout, perceived worklife fit, and turnover intention in a national sample of Counselor Education faculty. This chapter provides a discussion of the results and describes the limitations of the study. This study was exploratory in nature, and the results suggest directions for future research.

Overview of the Study

Burnout has implications for both the employer and the employee. Burnout is an experience not limited to a particular type of work (Golemiewski et al., 1998). Burnout can occur when an individual does not perceive an adequate fit in his or her work environment (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). When an individual’s expectations for the job are poorly matched by the reality of the job, exhaustion, cynicism, and feelings of professional inefficacy are more likely to occur. An employee may experience health consequences such as gastrointestinal problems or headaches, and absenteeism may increase (Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998). Additionally, an employee who is experiencing burnout can also affect the experience other employees have on the job (Bakker & Schaufeli, 2001). Burnout can also impact organizational and occupational commitment of the employee. Burnout can lead to employees’ choosing to leave the organization or the professional field altogether (Drake & Yadama, 1996; du Plooy & Roodt, 2010; Goodman & Boss, 2002). Although much research has been done exploring the consequences and causes of burnout, few studies have examined higher education and none has looked at the relationship among burnout, turnover intention, and person-environment fit in Counselor Education faculty.

In higher education, specifically in Counselor Education, the need for role models is paramount. The counseling profession has a wellness orientation and emphasizes the importance of self-care and balance (Yager & Tovar-Blank, 2007). Faculty in these programs are responsible for advising and
mentoring new counseling professionals into the field. If instructors are apathetic, drained, and struggling to meet productivity standards, students can be negatively impacted (Stern & Cox, 1993; Yager & Tovar-Blank, 2007). Similarly, new faculty can be unduly influenced by peers whose negativity create a toxic environment (N. R. Hill et al., 2005). Organizations suffer when their employees are not well (N. R. Hill, 2004). Therefore, it is crucial to understand the burnout phenomenon and its relationship with the person-environment fit and turnover intention in this population.

Little is known about burnout specifically in Counselor Education. Research examining burnout, turnover intention, and person-environment fit in higher education suggested the possibility of differences based on demographic differences. The preliminary research questions of the study were based on this research. The study looked for statistically significant variations based on gender (male vs. female), race (majority vs. minority), and tenure status (tenure vs. pre-tenured) in the burnout subscales (exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy), turnover intention, and six areas of worklife (community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload). The study also explored the relationships among the dependent variables: exhaustion, cynicism, professional inefficacy, turnover intention, community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload. Lastly, this study examined how the burnout subscales explain turnover intention in the sample.

Counselor Educators in the United States teaching in CACREP-accredited programs were eligible to participate. Participants were randomly selected and sent an online invitation to participate in the study. Participants completed the Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS; Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996) and a demographic survey. The survey included questions assessing turnover intention and perceived worklife fit. I invited 850 individuals to participate and 74 chose to complete the study. Ten were not included in the data analyses due to not meeting study criteria.

The results of the study contained some expected and some unexpected findings. Correlation analyses indicated relationships between the study variables in expected directions. As anticipated,
exhaustion was very strongly correlated with cynicism, and both had an inverse relationship with professional efficacy. Exhaustion had a moderate, positive relationship with turnover intention and a moderate, negative relationship with perceived worklife fit. Cynicism had a strong, positive relationship with turnover intention and a strong, negative relationship with perceived worklife fit. Interestingly, professional inefficacy did not have a statistically significant relationship with either turnover intention or perceived worklife fit. Turnover intention, predictably, had a strong, inverse relationship with perceived worklife fit. However, there were no statistically significant differences in burnout levels, perceived worklife fit, or turnover intention due to race or tenure status. There was a main effect for gender, but no subsequent univariate effect. Together, all three burnout subscales explained 23% of the variance in turnover intention. Only cynicism was found to be a predictor for turnover intention, whereas exhaustion and professional inefficacy were not significant predictors.

Discussion of the Results

The first analyses focused on the demographic characteristics of the sample. A MANOVA was performed to determine whether exhaustion, cynicism, and professional inefficacy varied based on gender, race, or tenure status. There appeared to be a main effect for gender; however, following additional analysis, no statistically significant univariate effects were found. It happens, however, that the package of dependent variables (although significantly different between men and women) cannot easily be explained or understood. These results are not surprising given the literature on burnout, turnover, and person-environment fit.

Demographic Factors Related to Burnout and Satisfaction

Differences in burnout levels in university faculty vary somewhat related to demographic factors in the few research studies published. Lackritz (2004) did not find statistically significant correlations between burnout and demographic differences other than age in university faculty. However, he did find a statistically significant difference between emotional exhaustion scores and depersonalization.
scores for men and women (emotional exhaustion higher in women and depersonalization higher in men). Similar gender differences were found in a study of online university educators, but were not statistically significant (R. L. Hogan & McKnight, 2007). Byrne (1991) found significant differences between male and female faculty with higher levels of emotional exhaustion and lower levels of personal accomplishment in female faculty. Doyle and Hind (1998) found no gender difference in burnout levels in a sample of psychology university faculty in the United Kingdom. They did, however, report that female faculty reported higher scores on the Faculty Stress Index and more women reported experiencing job strain. Bilge (2006) found that academic status (this study included research assistants, instructors, and professors in universities in Turkey) was predictive of emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment, and gender was predictive of depersonalization (with males reporting higher levels of depersonalization). Length of time within the state education system was statistically significant in a study of faculty in the California State University system, with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization levels higher for those who had been teaching in the system for less than ten years than for those teaching more than ten years (Blix et al., 1994). However, of the studies examining burnout in higher education, many studies did not report and/or collect information on race (Bilge, 2006; Blix et al., 1994; Byrne, 1991; Doyle & Hind, 1998; McClanahan, Giles, & Mallett, 2007; Siegel & McDonald, 2003) or tenure status (Byrne, 1991; Doyle & Hind, 1998; Siegel & McDonald, 2003).

Research specifically focused on burnout in university faculty is lacking; however, there are some studies examining job satisfaction in higher education. Job satisfaction correlates highly with all three subscales of burnout, most strongly with depersonalization/cynicism (Schaufeli & Enzman, 1998).

**Gender.** Overall, gender has not been found to be a strong predictor of burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Although there have been some studies in which women were found to have higher levels of burnout, the reverse has also been true in others (Schaufeli & Enzman, 1998). One finding often seen in studies on burnout, not reported in this sample, is that women report experiencing
more exhaustion, whereas men report greater depersonalization or cynicism (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). This result, the researchers noted, could be confounded with gender role stereotypes and sex-typed occupations, e.g., the majority of nurses being female. However, researchers using a large meta-analysis of 183 studies to explore gender differences in burnout found no differences based on male or female typed occupations but did find that American women report greater exhaustion and American men report greater depersonalization (compared to European workers; Purvanova & Muros, 2010). In their investigation, researchers found differences between males and females to be negligible for emotional exhaustion and small for depersonalization. Purvanova and Muros (2010) concluded that burnout may occur slightly more often in women but both genders may need help to ameliorate their burnout. Studies examining satisfaction in higher education have found inconsistent gender differences as well.

Higher education is a male-dominated field, and although women are obtaining doctoral degrees in greater numbers, they still occupy lower ranks than their male counterparts (M. S. West & Curtis, 2006). Some studies have found that women report lower job satisfaction than men in higher education (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Seifert & Umbach, 2008). However, in a study examining job satisfaction by gender and discipline in higher education, researchers found similar rates of job satisfaction in the social sciences (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). N. R. Hill and colleagues (2005) investigated factors that encourage or discourage female Counselor Educators continuation in the profession. Encouraging factors included a sense of autonomy in work and making a contribution the profession; discouraging factors consisted of a lack of mentors, toxic faculty environment, and financial concerns including faculty-related expense, needing more income than one’s base pay, and understanding the unwritten rules for merit pay. Researchers found that the sample of female Counselor Educators to have a high level of subjective well-being, and respondents’ life satisfaction was positively correlated with relationship and support factors and inversely correlated with negative
relationships and financial problems. Similarly, another study found collegiality and gender-based wage differentials impacted job satisfaction in expected directions, and this unfairness in wages was strongly linked to turnover intention (Hagedorn, 1996).

Other studies of faculty have not found gender to be a significant contributor to stress (N. R. Hill, 2009; Lease, 1999). Lease (1999) found no differences in gender in terms of stress in a study of occupational stress for faculty, as well as no differences for level of support or personal strain. Lease did find, however, greater interpersonal strain due to home-based tasks for female faculty. Circumstances at home can impact work-related satisfaction especially for women. In a study of the relationship between the value of workplace flexibility and life stages, male and female participants who were young and without children reported few differences in their use of workplace flexibility options and value of these options; however, this relationship was curvilinear throughout the lifespan (E. J. Hill et al., 2008). Women who were parents of preschoolers and school-aged children placed greater value on workplace flexibility options than men at the same life stage and these gender differences minimized for older and childless men and women. E. J. Hill and colleagues also found that gender predicted greater stress and burnout in their sample. Similarly, women participating in a study of university staff reported statistically more non-work stress (defined as hassles: health, work, financial, family, social, and environment) than men but not greater work stress (J. M. Hogan et al., 2002).

Overall, gender appears to be related to the combination of the subscales of burnout in this study; however, it is unclear how. Although gender differences have not been a consistent finding in the burnout literature in higher education, some research in job satisfaction has found that overall women tend to report lower job satisfaction than men. This lower job satisfaction rating could be influenced by work related factors such as pay inequity and advancement, as well as personal factors related to strain resulting from the interaction between home and work roles.
Race. The literature exploring burnout and race is too preliminary to reveal any trends (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Likewise, researchers studying occupational satisfaction of university faculty often do not include race in their data analysis at all (Barnes et al., 1998; Heckert & Farabee, 2006; Lee, Carswell, & Allen, 2000; Smart, 1990). In those that do include this demographic variable, the results are mixed. In a study of job satisfaction of university faculty in research-extensive universities, researchers found no differences in job satisfaction based on race (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011). Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found that minority faculty reported lower satisfaction with compensation and greater turnover. However, Rosser (2004) found minority faculty to have similar levels of satisfaction when compared to Caucasian faculty. Another study found that whereas African-Americans were equally or more satisfied than Caucasian counterparts across faculty disciplinary groups, Asian faculty were least satisfied (Sabharwal & Corley, 2009). By contrast, Niemann and Dovidio (1998) found the opposite result with African American faculty reporting lower job satisfaction overall and Asian and Hispanic faculty reporting lower but not significantly different satisfaction than Caucasian faculty. Few studies in Counselor Education have recruited adequate numbers of minority faculty to warrant generalization to the population; however, N. R. Hill (2009) found no main effect or interactional affects due to minority status. In a study of minority Counselor Education faculty (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2002), the majority of the faculty sampled were not tenured, leading the researchers to conclude that the participants were either leaving their positions before being granted tenure or new to the profession. Another study by the same researchers found that African-American Counselor Educators reported barriers to the tenure and promotion such as racism, unequal treatment, and a lack of mentorship and support from colleagues (Bradley & Holcomb-McCoy, 2004).

There is a paucity of literature on the relationship between race and burnout or job satisfaction. Some researchers have not included this variable in their studies, others have not recruited an adequate number of minority participants as is the case of this study. This study did not find any differences
based on race, as has been found in some other studies. However, it is clear from the literature that there may be a lot more to understand about the experience of minority faculty once sufficiently investigated.

**Tenure status.** Tenured faculty members are often perceived as having less stress and greater satisfaction than pre-tenured or new faculty. A study that examined faculty across disciplines found satisfaction to be higher in full professors than in associate or assistant professors and those with tenure to be more satisfied than those without it (Sabharwall & Corley, 2009). However, Rosser (2004) found that tenured professors in her study perceived their worklife as less positive. She attributed these findings to the pressures related to grant funding, service on university committees, and keeping up with ever-changing technology. This less positive view of worklife did not lead tenured faculty to choose to leave their institutions, but minority faculty did report greater turnover intention (Rosser, 2004).

Similarly, many researchers have found greater stress and burnout for new faculty (Byrne, 1991, N. R. Hill, 2004; Sorcinelli, 1994). Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin (2000) identified a type of reality shock experienced by new faculty. They found that “what early-career faculty hoped for and need from their work life do not fully match what they actually experience over time. A troubling gap exists between the vision and reality of the academic career” (Rice, Sorcinelli, & Austin, 2000, p. 6, italics in original). The researchers found the faculty reported satisfaction with their careers but nearly all rated their work as stressful. This finding is similar to the results of a longitudinal study interviewing a group of Counselor Educators hired in 2000 throughout the first six years of their careers (Magnuson, Norem, & Lonneman-Doroff, 2009).

This study found no differences between pre-tenured and tenured Counselor Education faculty in terms of burnout. This is consistent with other research that found no differences in terms of occupational strain according to seniority (Lease, 1999). Few studies have investigated the role tenure status may have regarding satisfaction and/or burnout. However, levels of occupational commitment,
sources of stress and factors influencing fit have been found to differ depending on demographic variables.

**The Relationship between Perceived Fit and Turnover Intention**

Human behavior is a function of the interaction between the person and his or her environment (Conyne & Cook, 2004). Furthermore, individuals derive meaning from that interaction and this is the lens through which they view the world. When considering person-environment fit in the workplace, the individual’s perception of this fit filtered through his or her own cultural lens will impact their satisfaction and commitment. This study found that perceived worklife fit and turnover intention have a strong, negative correlation. However, both perceived worklife fit and turnover intention did not vary based on gender, race, or tenure status for Counselor Educators in this study. This result varies somewhat from research of faculty perceptions of their person-environment fit and their intent to leave.

**Demographic variables.** Marchiori and Henkin (2004) examined types of occupational commitment (affective, continuance, and normative) in faculty members. Researchers found no gender differences in affective commitment (e.g., emotional or attitudinal attachment to an institution) or continuance commitment (e.g., related to costs of leaving and benefits of staying). Female faculty did have higher scores in normative commitment to the workplace than men. Employees with a high normative commitment feel pressure to act in a way that meets the organization’s goals and interests and report higher levels of loyalty to the employer (Wiener, 1982). This may explain why women with lower satisfaction may not necessarily have higher levels of turnover. Similarly, Barnes and colleagues (1998) found that males and pre-tenured faculty were more likely to report turnover intention. However, other researchers have found no difference in terms of gender in turnover intention (Conklin & Desselle, 2007; Heckert & Farabee, 2006; Ryan, Healy, & Sullivan, 2012).

Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found that minority faculty, pre-tenured or tenured, are more likely to leave. Similarly, Rosser (2004) found that minority faculty had greater turnover intention. Tenured
faculty, on the other hand, commonly have a stronger intention to stay than non-tenured faculty (Machiori & Henkin, 2004; Rosser, 2004; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Job factors can play a role in turnover intention. For example, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) found that tenured faculty with higher salaries are less likely to turnover and female pre-tenured faculty reported greater turnover intention due to their lower satisfaction with job security. Magnuson and colleagues conducted a six year longitudinal study interviewing a group of Counselor Educators hired in the year 2000 (Magnuson, 2002; Magnuson & Black, 2006; Magnuson, Norem, & Haberstroh, 2001; Magnuson, Norem, & Lonneman-Doroff, 2009; Magnuson, Shaw, Tubin, Norem, 2004). Of the 43 pre-tenured professors who initially participated in the study, five had left the profession, thirteen participants stayed at their original institution, and seven relocated once, and two relocated twice (Magnuson, Norem, & Lonneman-Doroff, 2009). Participants who left reported issues related to unclear tenure and promotion expectations and fit with program faculty. Career length has been correlated with higher levels of organizational commitment. Smart (1990) found that faculty with a longer association with the career are less likely to leave the position. Marchiori and Henkin (2004) found that individuals with longer careers in higher education, not just with their current university, report greater commitment to their university. On the other hand, other studies have found academic rank or tenure status not to be predictive of turnover intention (Conklin & Desselle, 2007; Heckert & Farabee, 2006; Ryan et al., 2012). These findings indicate that commitment to an organization may also involve other factors.

**Person-environment fit.** Congruence with one’s work environment can be grouped into the six areas of worklife factors: community, control, fairness, reward, values, and workload. Satisfaction is determined by the individual’s assessment of these factors. In this study, participants had relatively high satisfaction in each of the six areas of worklife, with values rated highest and reward lowest. The factors were all positively correlated with each other, except that community and workload did not have a statistically significant relationship. The areas of worklife, as theorized by Maslach and Leiter (1999),
have not been explicitly studied in the higher education literature; however, many studies address the issues individually.

Rosser (2004), for example, found that the quality of worklife had a significant impact on the satisfaction of faculty members; however, factors such individual characteristics, worklife issues, and satisfaction contribute to turnover. Similarly, another study found that degree of fit depended on both demographic factors and congruence between the individual and institutions’ values and goals (Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995). Household responsibilities and having a significant other predicted leaving academia, whereas fit and support decreased the chances of leaving (Ryan et al., 2012). Blix and colleagues (1994) found a statistically significant correlation between stress and turnover intention among female faculty. However, researchers were unable to test whether misfit correlated with stress symptoms because few faculty experienced a misfit in the sample (Blix et al., 1994). Barnes and colleagues (1998) found that the lack of a sense of community predicted turnover intention, but less so than stress due to time commitment of faculty. Faculty felt an insufficient time to complete tasks adequately; that one’s personal life is consumed with work; and the job was a significant source of stress. Barnes and colleagues (1998) found that, regardless of how faculty perceived their institutional fit, time commitment significantly predicted intent to leave. Collegial social interaction and fairness in pay (specifically, perceiving that one is paid market value) was found to predict job satisfaction for faculty in STEM disciplines research universities (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011). Fairness does not need to relate only to pay. For women and faculty of color, perceptions about equitable treatment may be more important than for Caucasian men. Unfortunately, as suggested in another qualitative study, many faculty do not feel supported by their colleagues and institutions, perceptions that may influence faculty job satisfaction and retention (Ambrose et al., 2005). It appears that faculty perceptions about their institutions and their positions within them are crucial to explore in future research.
The variety of methodological approaches described above to assess faculty satisfaction reveals the variability in factors that contribute to the experience of teaching in higher education. Perceived worklife fit is a variable that represents how individuals weigh these factors in their subjective assessment of congruence with their work environment. In research reported here, overall perceived fit was between tolerable and satisfactory. Demographic factors did not result in mean differences in this score. Exhaustion and cynicism were negatively correlated to perceived worklife fit, whereas professional efficacy had a weak positive correlation with the variable but was not statistically significant. As stated above, perceived worklife fit has a strong negative relationship with turnover intention.

**Burnout in Relationship to Perceived Fit and Turnover**

In the current study, burnout scores were moderate in this sample, with each subscale mean falling in the moderate rating range. Other studies of burnout in university faculty have found exhaustion to be between low (Taris, Schreurs, & Schaufeli, 1999) and moderate (McClenahan et al., 2007; Rothmann & Barkhuizen, 2008), cynicism reported as moderate (McClenahan et al., 2007; Taris et al., 1999), and low levels of professional efficacy (Taris et al., 1999). Bartley’s (2005) dissertation study on burnout in Counselor Educators found low levels of burnout; however, the study used the Burnout Measure – Short Form so there is no way to compare the results from her study to these results from the MBI-GS. In the current sample of Counselor Educators, the cynicism subscale predicted turnover intention, contributing 10% respectively to the variance. Exhaustion and professional efficacy were not significant predictors. Cynicism represents a mental distancing from the source of stress (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). The MBI-GS uses the term cynicism rather than depersonalization since it is intended for individuals who work in environments where service provision is not the primary focus (Maslach, Jackson et al., 1996).
The MBI-GS was designed for use outside the helping professions, representing a change in focus in the theoretical foundation of burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Where “depersonalization refers to an impersonal and dehumanized perception of recipients, characterized by a callous, negative, and detached attitude... cynicism reflects an indifferent or distant attitude toward one’s work instead of other people” (Salanova, Llorens, Garcia-Renedo, Burriel, Breso, & Schaufeli, 2005, p. 808), therefore, the components represent different types of mental distancing.

Over time, experiencing continued mismatches in the relationship between the worker and the work environment can result in burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Mismatches can occur in one or many of the six areas of worklife; however, when an individual experiences congruence with the work environment, his or her occupation commitment is higher (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). Frequent organizational change, however, can breed burnout and cynicism regarding change, and can impact morale, performance, and turnover (Caldwell, Herold, & Fedor, 2004). Job satisfaction can be conceptualized as a continuum between active engagement in work and disengagement (Hagedorn, 2000). Job satisfaction has a high inverse relationship with the mental distancing; however, job dissatisfaction and cynicism are conceptually different, with cynicism including disillusionment, contempt, and distrust toward one’s work (Andersson, 1998). When faculty disengage, negative outcomes for both the individual and the organization are often the result.

Ambrose and colleagues (2005) uncovered significant levels of dissatisfaction among senior faculty who were disengaged from their departments. The faculty exhibited their disengagement in four ways: a) withdrawal from collaboration with colleagues, b) lack of involvement with decision-making, c) withdrawal from social activities, and d) disengagement from mentoring and/or “giving cynical advice to junior faculty” (Huston, Norman, & Ambrose, 2007, p. 496). Similarly, Baker-Fletcher, Carr, Menn, and Ramsay (2005) stated, “If we are honest, we must admit that some faculty members at mid-career are infected by a deepening reservoir of frustration, cynicism, and anger with the institution where they
work” (p. 7). These feelings, some of which stem from the tenure process, resulted in withdrawal from committees, social events, and a lack of collaboration with others in decision-making. Another qualitative study found that how faculty resolve professional conflict is important in understanding dissatisfaction in the workplace (Reybold, 2005). Participants with the most extreme conflict reported unrealistic expectations of academic life. According to Reybold (2005), faculty who focus on the conflict may experience disillusionment, disengagement, and eventually turnover; however, those who engage in reflection and action to resolve the conflict can experience growth. Not all faculty members experiencing cynicism will leave their institution; faculty unable to leave positions due to personal or professional reasons may simply disengage.

These are the faculty we all know as ‘names on a door’, spending no more time on campus than required to teach their classes. In my own experience, these are often faculty who at one time were emotionally involved in their work, but over time have come to doubt their university’s motives, action, and values (Bedeian, 2007, p. 25).

Faculty with higher levels of depersonalization may shift their time to spend more time on non-work activities, which is another way to create mental distance (Siegall & McDonald, 2003).

Cynicism can result from the violation of a psychological contract (Andersson, 1998). As discussed in Chapter One, a psychological contract is formed when an individual accepts a position and mutual agreement is formed between the employee and the employer which can be both written and unwritten (Rousseau, 1989). The subjective beliefs form a mental schema and represent a promise between the employee and the employer (Rousseau, 2001). When this contract is violated, the result can be decreases in satisfaction and trust, and increases in turnover intention and actual turnover (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Of the twelve disengaged senior faculty discussed in Huston et al., (2007), seven of them experienced contract violations but remained at the university.
In summary, a complex interaction exists among factors such as fit in the work environment, satisfaction, stressors, and support, as well as personal and institutional factors that all play a role in whether faculty intend to leave. Lindholm (2003) made one exceptionally important point as she concluded her article reflecting on a quantitative study of university faculty,

Nevertheless, ‘reality’ within this university environment is, in many ways, a collective sentiment that conspicuously lacks a collective voice. In other words, while faculty shared many common perceptions, experiences, and opinions, they also reported a prevailing notion that their interpretations of meaning were somehow uniquely theirs (p. 143).

Therefore, what is often not captured by survey studies, like the present study, is the meaning faculty attribute to subjective concepts such as ‘fit’ and how it is related to the experience of burnout and the intent to leave one’s position.

This study examined a small sample of Counselor Education faculty. The participants reported moderate levels of exhaustion, cynicism, and personal inefficacy, tolerable to satisfactory perceived worklife fit, and a low level of turnover intention. There were no differences due to race and tenure status; however, a main effect was found for gender but no univariate effects. Perceived fit was negatively correlated with exhaustion, cynicism, and turnover intention. Cynicism predicted turnover intention. The results are consistent with the overall research in higher education. However, as with all studies, there are limitations or weaknesses in the study.

Limitations

There were several limitations to the present study. This study used online using self-report data. Online research has many advantages in terms of convenience, cost, and time; however, there are disadvantages in terms of sampling that must be addressed (K. B. Wright, 2005). Sampling in online surveys can be difficult because there is often no way to know the size of the true population, response-rates can vary, and there can be self-selection bias. I attempted to minimize sampling problems by
developing a list of the entire population, using random selection, and emailing the survey link directly to participants to better ensure that the survey was completed by the individuals for whom it was intended. However, some participants choose not participate in survey research, which may affect the generalizability of the data. For example, one participant emailed me to state that normally he or she did not complete online survey requests but recognized my name and did complete this survey.

This study did have a low response rate, especially during the initial phase of the study. had to identify another sample from the population to reach an adequate sample size. Therefore, it is possible that participants who completed the study are different categorically from those who chose not to participate. However, there is no way to know whether these differences would have been related to the current study. Because this study investigated burnout, it is possible that those who are experiencing greater levels of burnout may not take the time to complete a voluntary survey or some participants may have been more eager to speak about their experiences. Additionally, self-report data can have validity issues due to the possibility that some respondents may not understand the questions or answer truthfully (Wharton, Potter, & Parry, 2004). I made every effort to ensure that the data remained anonymous, such as using an information sheet rather than a consent form, not collecting individual information such as university or region, and severing the tie between login information and the data that were subsequently collected. Finally, because the Transform system requires an additional level of security requiring participants to enter their email and set a temporary password, and this additional step could have discouraged some faculty from participating.

This study was cross-sectional and administered only once; therefore, there is no way to know how stable the results would be over time or whether the results would fluctuate if participants were to complete the survey again. The study was designed to collect data during the mid-point of the quarter or semester. I purposely chose this time to avoid the natural stress of the beginning and end of the academic term. However, due to the low response rate, survey completion lasted longer than
anticipated. Other factors could have influenced burnout levels between February and late April for the participants. Lackritz (2004) noted timing could play an important role in burnout in academic faculty because of the variability from term to term and year to year. However, Capel (1991, as cited in Schaufeli & Enzman, 1997) found that burnout levels in teachers remained relatively stable when measured across a longer time interval (nine months versus four or five months), concluding that stress levels vary depending on season-specific events (e.g., holidays and exams). Similarly, Westman and Eden (1997) found that vacations can reduce burnout levels temporarily. Unfortunately, pre-vacation burnout levels began to return after three days back at work and fully by three weeks back at work.

There are many variables not addressed in this study that could have had a significant impact on burnout levels and turnover intention. Age is one variable that is consistently related to burnout, with higher levels of burnout found in those under 30 or 40 years of age (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001). For example, Brewer and Shepard (2004) using meta-analysis found a small negative correlation between age and emotional exhaustion, but an inconsistent correlation between burnout and work experience. Counselor Education requires a doctoral degree; therefore, including age as a variable could be confounded with work experience and survival bias (e.g., individuals with higher burnout scores leave the field, leaving behind those with lower levels of burnout). In this sample, there was no one under the age of 30 and only 22% of the participants were under the age of 40. This study did not access marital status or family responsibilities, which have been shown to impact turnover intention (Ambrose et al., 2005; Ryan et al., 2012). Compensation has also been a factor that influences turnover intention (Heckert & Farabee, 2006; Smart, 1990). However, this study did not investigate this factor, which could be helpful in attracting and retaining new faculty members in counselor education.

This study asked only one question regarding a formal mentorship program and did not specifically address social support. Further research is necessary to get a better understanding about the role of a mentor and the benefit mentoring could have on burnout and turnover intention.
Burnout in Counselor Education

Mentoring has also been proposed as a solution to improve research (Atieno Okech et al., 2006), to increase publication records (Roland & Fontanesi-Seime, 1996), and to improve the satisfaction of faculty members (Ambrose et al., 2005; Seifert & Umbach, 2008). Mentoring programs, orientations, and workshops could be used to assist new faculty with their own professional development, as well as with the tenure and promotion process (Borders et al., 2011; Seifert & Umbach, 2008; Sorcinelli, 1994). Mentoring has been suggested by numerous studies to ameliorate the stress associated with being pre-tenured (N. R. Hill et al., 2005; Rice et al., 2000), as well as to recruit and retain diverse faculty (Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008; Holcomb-McCoy & Bradley, 2003; Seifert & Umbach, 2008). Likewise, social support has also been found to act as a “shield” against emotional exhaustion and mental distancing in educators (Otero-Lopez et al., 2008, p. 770).

This study, as with most other studies of burnout, could be used to suggest but not demonstrate causal relationships. Therefore, one cannot conclude that a negatively perceived worklife fit caused higher burnout levels or that higher burnout levels caused turnover intention. We know only that there is a high correlation between the variables. Additionally, the results of this study may not be easily generalizable. This study utilized a national sample of counselor education faculty; therefore, one is limited in illustrating local conditions that affect faculty members’ experiences. The result of this exploratory study validates the need for future studies.

The present study compiled data from individuals regarding their perceptions of their work environment. To better understand issues such as turnover intention in context, research will need to take place at the organizational level to develop theories regarding how an organization can affect members’ perceptions and behaviors in the workplace (Johnsrud et al., 2000). However, many studies (including this one), are conducted at the individual level of analysis, which is insufficient to address the complexities of the organizational setting (Johnsrud et al., 2000). This study investigated the relationship between burnout and turnover intention, but it is unclear whether turnover intention in
this population would also be predictive of actual turnover as in other careers (Lee & Mowday, 1987) due to limited number of counselor education programs that are hiring (Barrio Minton, Myers, & Morganfield, 2012). This study found that, of the three dimensions of burnout, cynicism predicted turnover intention. Cynicism can develop as a result from dissatisfaction with aspects of the job (e.g., salary, time constraints, work overload) or from perceived violation of the psychological contract. Mental distancing has been found to be a factor in turnover intention in other populations (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Leiter & Maslach, 2009) and plays a role for faculty in mediating the relationship between interpersonal conflict and turnover intention and excessive job demands and turnover intention (Moreno-Jimenez et al., 2009). Therefore, university administrators will continue to have difficulty attracting and maintain exceptional faculty if specific factors that contribute to burnout and affect person-environment fit are not addressed.

**Implications for Practice**

Despite the limitations of this exploratory study, the results contribute to the small but growing literature on occupational wellness in higher education, specifically in Counselor Education. This study has implications for practice. Given what is already known in the literature, there are suggestions that could be implemented in doctoral training and mentoring relationships.

The findings emphasize the importance of congruence in fit in higher education. For doctoral students or recent graduates seeking work in Counselor Education, the importance of being true to one’s own values, goals, academic philosophies, and desires regarding work priorities is critical. Applicants should be aware of their own needs regarding the six areas of worklife and seek an environment consistent with these personal workplace needs. It is vital that doctoral training programs assist doctoral students with building self-awareness and developing and implementing self-care practices; creating opportunities to be involved in research, teaching and service; as well as educating students about the political nature of academia and expectations beyond teaching, scholarship, and
professional service. For those who intend to enter higher education, Magnuson and colleagues (2009) suggested exploring the following topics when interviewing: “workload, expectations for scholarship and service, support for research, requirements for tenure and promotion, camaraderie among Counselor Educators, potential for effective mentoring, and program philosophies” (p. 68). Acquiring a more thorough understanding of the life of a faculty member could substantially mitigate the reality shock experienced by many upon entering higher education careers.

For Counselor Educators already working in higher education who are experiencing symptoms indicative of burnout, understanding which areas of worklife are incongruent in the present environment can suggest actions to ameliorate burnout. For example, faculty who experience a sense of alienation within their own program can seek to improve this by organizing a group (inside or outside the program) for support through work and/or social activities. Existing faculty can welcome newcomers to the program with a positive, open attitude to buffer them from a culture that may be cold and impersonal (Leiter & Maslach, 2005). In this study, cynicism played an important role in predicting turnover intention and had a strong inverse relationship with perceived worklife fit. However, in higher education, faculty experiencing cynicism may result in disengagement and pollute the academic environment for both students and professional colleagues.

Cynicism can be a powerful experience that infiltrates all aspects of the work environment. It can result from being unaware of the terms of the job upon hiring or can result from personnel or organizational changes that take place over time. For those who have created mental distance between themselves and their students or workplace, articulating the circumstances that have resulted in this feeling can give rise to a solution, whether it is a diversion of resources, seeking assistance, or planning for departure. Given the contagious nature of burnout, changes in both the individual and the environment may be necessary to improve the experience at work.
Future Directions for Research

The results from this study suggest further research needed in the area of Counselor Education faculty. This study has made a useful contribution to the professional literature regarding additional information not captured in Bartley’s (2005) dissertation study. The previous study examined internal and external factors associate with burnout and she suggested examining the interplay between internal and external factors. Future research should use the Areas of Worklife Scale AWS (AWS; Leiter & Maslach, 2004) to examine further the role these distinct areas have in burnout and develop a mediation model to learn more about the interrelationships between the areas in this population. Because the areas of worklife can play a role in organizational commitment, further research can examine turnover intention in Counselor Educators using the AWS. Similarly, researchers should further examine the university environment to better understand the organizational impact on individuals’ burnout and intention to leave the university. Xu’s research suggested that the “subjective perception of work environment plays a more critical role in faculty turnover than the objective conditions” (2008; p. 58); therefore, focus should be set on creating a positive work environment that promotes professional development since this is a global concern of faculty.

Future research could investigate the predictive validity of turnover intention in counselor education on actual turnover. Longitudinal studies, such as Magnuson and colleagues (2009), have followed individuals who have left academia and recorded their reasons for leaving the occupation. Further studies of this kind would be beneficial in understanding what factors contribute toward leaving a position, insights that could help directors and administrators maintain faculty and staff. Clearly, many faculty members today make workplace decisions in combination with other life contexts. Data regarding compensation, promotion and tenure policies, or work/home policies may add a necessary component to understanding the university environment for some faculty. Lastly, researchers could explore the impact of crucial diversity variables – for example, race / ethnicity, or relationship / family
role status – to understand the unique contributions of these variables. The dissertation research of McCortney (2005) examined the work and life factors that contribute to the quality of work experience for Counselor Educators, found gender to be statistically significant. Researchers should remember that even faculty themselves may not be able to determine the relative contributions and costs of these complex variables (cf., Constantine, Smith, Redington, & Owens, 2008). Further exploring experiences such as these would be beneficial to addressing the specific factors that contribute to the experience of discrimination and unequal treatment some faculty report experiencing. Finally, investigating the role mentoring has had on faculty burnout and workplace satisfaction may give rise to improved person-environment fit for all faculty.

As stated earlier, each university environment is unique and interventions intended to reduce burnout or improve satisfaction, morale, engagement, or occupational wellness should be tailored to fit the environment. Qualitative research could be used to better understand perceptions of a particular group of faculty (N. R. Hill et al., 2005). Xu (2008) encouraged the specific study of individual ethnic groups rather than creating one demographic group of minorities as was done in this study. Similarly, to effect change on a more local level, qualitative or mixed-methods research could provide context and details not captured by most survey research (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005). Using a model such as the practitioner-as-researcher model (Bensimon, Pokinghorne, Bauman, & Vallejo, 2004) could permit an individual faculty member to effect change in his or her institution. Without the intent to generalize to an outside population, research could focus on improving circumstances within one organization. By attending to the working conditions in everyday life, individual lives and organizations could be changed.

**Conclusion**

The present study assessed the level of burnout in Counselor Education faculty during the 2011-2012 school year between February and April of 2012. Demographic variables such as gender, race, and tenure status, were analyzed to determine differences as a result of these personal factors. This study
used a person-environment organizational framework and measured perceived worklife fit for faculty members who participated in the study. Lastly, the burnout subscales were used to predict turnover intention. Participants were randomly selected from a nationwide pool of CACREP-accredited Counselor Education programs and 64 eligible participants took part in the online study. Data analyses found that cynicism predicted turnover intention and race and tenure status were not statistically significant variables. There was a main effect for gender, but no univariate effects were found. Therefore, it is difficult to explain the complex relationship between gender and burnout. The findings were discussed and related to the available theoretical and empirical research on the topic. The limitations of the study were explored and implications for those in Counselor Education were discussed.

This exploratory study is a first step to beginning to understand the burnout phenomenon in Counselor Education faculty. The results indicate that cynicism is powerful contributor to the experience of burnout in faculty, but that finding introduces many more questions. Future research on a nationwide scale should further investigate the person-environment fit and the factors leading to turnover intention and causal factors of actual turnover. However, to design interventions to ameliorate burnout in this population, qualitative methodology should be used to gain additional insight into the circumstances at the local university level. Both large and small focused studies are crucial to understanding the experience of faculty in Counselor Education. Change requires both “big picture” and “small focus” work.
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Appendix A

1. What is your age in years? _____
2. What is your race/ethnicity? (please choose one that you think most closely resembles how you identify yourself)
   - African-American/Afro-Caribbean/Black/African Descent
   - Hispanic/Latina/Latino
   - Caucasian/White/European Descent
   - Native American/Indian/First Nation/American Indian
   - Asian/Polynesian/Pacific Islander
   - Middle-Eastern Descent
   - Biracial/Multiracial (please describe): _________________________
   - Other (please describe): _________________________
3. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male
   - Other (please describe): _________________________
4. What is your highest level of education completed?
   - MA/MS/M.Ed.
   - Ph.D./Ed.D. in Counselor Education and Supervision
   - Ph.D. in Psychology
   - Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology
   - Psy.D.
   - Other (please describe): _________________________
5. Are you currently teaching in a Counselor Education program that is CACREP-accredited?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Other: _________________________
6. How many years have you been faculty at your current university? _____
7. How many years have you been faculty in counselor education? _____
8. If you are non-tenured, which of these options describe your status?
   - Not applicable - tenured
   - Adjunct
   - Non-tenure track
   - Clinical or field service faculty
   - Pre-tenured – Assistant
   - Pre-tenured - Associate
   - Other: _________________________
9. If you are tenured, which of these options describe your status?
   - Not applicable – not tenured
   - Tenured – Assistant
   - Tenured – Associate
   - Tenured - Full
   - Other: _________________________
10. How does your university view the importance of the following in term of daily job activities?

Teaching (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Research (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Grant-writing (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

University service (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Community service (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Clinical practice (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

11. How do you view the importance of the following in term of daily job activities?

Teaching (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Research (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Grant-writing (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

University service (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Community service (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

Clinical practice (1-unimportant, 2 – of little importance, 3 – moderately important, 4-important, 5-very important)

12. Which statement best characterizes your primary role in your program?

_____Administrative position/Chair (with course release)

_____Program Coordinator (with course release)

_____Program faculty (teaching a full load)

_____Part-time program faculty

_____Research faculty (course release from teaching)

_____Joint appointment (teaching in counseling program plus official appointment in administration or other capacities)

_____Other (please describe): ___________________________________________

13. How many graduate level classes are you currently teaching this term? _____

14. Is your university on a quarter or semester schedule?

_____Quarter

_____Semester

15. How many undergraduate level classes are you currently teaching this term? _____

16. How many classes are you teaching per academic year? _____

17. How many thesis committees do you serve as chair at this time? _____

18. How many dissertation committees do you serve as chair at this time? _____

19. How many committees (thesis or dissertation) do you serve on not as chair? _____
20. When you began your current position at your university was there a formal mentoring experience?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   _____ Other (please describe): ______________________________________________________________________
21. How many hours do you estimate you spend on the job during a typical week? ______
22. How personally committed to your job do you feel you are as compared to other faculty in your program? (1- much less, 3-about the same, 5 – much more)
23. How does your workload compare to other faculty in your department? (1- below average, 3-
   average, 5 – above average)
24. I plan on leaving my current faculty position within the next year (1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree,
   3-Undecided, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree)
25. I have been actively looking for other faculty positions (1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-
   Undecided, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree)
26. I want to remain in my faculty position (1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Undecided, 4- Agree, 5-
   Strongly Agree)
27. If I were to leave this position, I will be seeking employment outside the field of higher education (1-
   Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Undecided, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree)
28. If I were to leave this position, I will move into a lateral or a higher position at another university (1-
   Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Undecided, 4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree)
29. If I were to leave this position, it would be to retire. (1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3-Undecided,
   4- Agree, 5- Strongly Agree)
30. If you were to leave this year, what reasons would you list? __________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________________
31. Please choose one of the following options:
   _____ I am confident I will be awarded tenure at my current university.
   _____ I am unsure as to whether I will be awarded tenure at my current university.
   _____ I do not believe I will be awarded tenure at my current university.
   _____ I did not receive tenure at my current university and am actively looking for other
   positions during my terminal year.
   _____ I have tenure, and I believe I would be awarded tenure today based by university’s
   present expectations.
   _____ I have tenure, but I am not sure I would be awarded tenure today based on my
   university’s present expectations.
   _____ I have tenure, but I do not believe I would be awarded tenure today based on my
   university’s present expectations.
   _____ Not applicable – I’m not in a tenure-track position.
   _____ Other (please describe): ______________________________________________________________________
32. Considering your current work environment, please indicate the degree of fit between yourself and your environment in terms of: (1-highly unsatisfactory, 2- unsatisfactory, 3- tolerable, 4- satisfactory, 5 – highly satisfactory)

_____ Values – Issues of honesty or meaningfulness of work
_____ Reward - Issues related to recognition or compensation for one’s work
_____ Community – Issues pertaining to relationships at work
_____ Fairness - Issues concerning justice such as respect, personal differences, or equity
_____ Workload – Issues regarding schedule, type, or amount of work
_____ Control – Issues due to autonomy, administration, or policy issues

32. Comments: ________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
Email Recruitment Letter:

Subject: Requesting your participation in a dissertation study

Dear Potential Research Participant,

My name is Susannah Coaston and I am currently a doctoral candidate in the counselor education program at the University of Cincinnati. I am recruiting participants for a research study, which I am conducting under the supervision of Dr. Ellen Cook. I invite you to complete a survey exploring your perceptions of your job. You are eligible for the survey if you are a counselor educator in a CACREP-accredited counseling program.

Professional expectations are varied for counselor educators, and, beyond teaching a full course load, typically include research, publications, and presentations, mentorship and advising, as well as service activities such as departmental or programmatic duties, community involvement, and a wide variety of other tasks. Few empirical studies, however, have explored the perceptions of counselor educators regarding the impact of these professional expectations. Hence, your participation will educate administration, counselor education preparation, and future research regarding the impact of these roles. It is important you take and complete this survey at your earliest convenience.

This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Cincinnati (Insert approval date/number). Data will be collected via the online survey system, Transform, created by Mind Garden, Inc. The data collected and reported will be completely anonymous and will not include participant names, e-mail addresses, or personal Internet identifiers. Although you will use your name and email to log into the Transform system, this information will suppressed by Mind Garden and will not be shared with the researcher. Identifying information will not be collect in the online survey.

Your consent to be a research participant is strictly voluntary and should you decline to participate or should you choose to drop out at any time during the study, there will be no adverse effects.

If you choose to participate in this research study, you will be asked to do the following:

* Go to the link listed below that connects to the on-line questionnaire: (Insert survey link)

* Please review the Information sheet and decide whether or not to participate. Your participation is voluntary and you have the option to discontinue the study at any time.

* You will then be presented with a demographics questionnaire and a job attitudes survey which should take no more than 20 to 30 minutes to complete.

If you would like further Information about this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at coastosc@mail.uc.edu.

Thank you very much for your time and participation!
- Susannah Coaston, MA, PCC-S
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Information Sheet for Research
University of Cincinnati
Department: Human Services,
College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services
Principal Investigator: Susannah Coaston
Faculty Advisor: Ellen Cook, Ph.D.

Title of Study: Counselor education faculty member’s perceptions about their jobs in higher education.

Introduction:
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Please read this paper carefully and ask questions about anything that you do not understand.

Who is doing this research study?
The person in charge of this research study is Susannah Coaston under the supervision of Dr. Ellen Cook (faculty advisor) of the University of Cincinnati (UC) School of Human Services.

What is the purpose of this research study?
This study will explore counselor educator’s perceptions about their jobs within higher education.

Who will be in this research study?
You may participate in this study if you are a full-time tenure track professor in Counselor Education teaching in a CACREP-accredited program.

What will you be asked to do in this research study, and how long will it take?
You will be asked to complete one online survey and provide some demographic information. The entire process could take 20 to 30 minutes.

Are there any risks to being in this research study?
There are minimal risks to participants in this study. Participants could feel uncomfortable answering questions relating to possible dissatisfaction within their work environment.

Are there any benefits from being in this research study?
There are no direct benefits for completing this research study.

What will you get because of being in this research study?
You will not receive anything for taking part in this research study.

Do you have choices about taking part in this research study?
You are free to choose not to participate or withdraw from this study at any time.
**How will your research information be kept confidential?**
Information about you will be kept private by being held in a secure database that is password-protected and accessible only by the principal investigator. Responses are anonymous and are not linked to any university or institution.

Your information will be kept two years and will be deleted at the completion of the data analysis following the study.

Agents of the University of Cincinnati may inspect study records for audit or quality assurance purposes.

**What are your legal rights in this research study?**
Nothing in this consent form waives any legal rights you may have. This consent form also does not release the investigator, the institution, or its agents from liability for negligence.

**What if you have questions about this research study?**
If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, you should contact Susannah Coaston, the principal investigator, at Coastose@mail.uc.edu. Or, you may contact Dr. Ellen Cook, the faculty advisor, at Ellen.Cook@uc.edu or 513-556-3343.

The UC Institutional Review Board reviews all research projects that involve human participants to be sure the rights and welfare of participants are protected.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant or complaints about the study, you may contact the UC IRB at (513) 558-5259. Or, you may call the UC Research Compliance Hotline at (800) 889-1547, or write to the IRB, 300 University Hall, ML 0567, 51 Goodman Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0567, or email the IRB office at irb@ucmail.uc.edu.

**Do you HAVE to take part in this research study?**
No one has to be in this research study. Refusing to take part will NOT cause any penalty or loss of benefits that you would otherwise have. You may start and then change your mind and stop at any time. To stop being in the study, you should discontinue completion of the online survey and close your internet browser.

**BY COMPLETING THE FOLLOWING SURVEYS, YOU INDICATE YOUR CONSENT FOR YOUR ANSWERS TO BE USED IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY.**

**PLEASE PRINT A COPY OF THIS INFORMATION SHEET FOR YOUR REFERENCE.**
Appendix D

The following table depicts the level of satisfaction in each of the six areas of worklife from the original data. Values had the highest overall rating of satisfaction, which represents congruence in the ideals and motivations of the organization (Maslach & Leiter, 1999). These values may be what appealed to the individual during the job search. Values are an important component of the psychological contract (Rousseau, 1989) and mismatches can result in burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli et al., 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Worklife</th>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highly Satisfactory
Satisfactory
Tolerable
Unsatisfactory
Highly Unsatisfactory