Burnout, a problem that relates to an individual’s occupation or vocational life, is a prolonged manifestation of emotional exhaustion, cynicism related to work, physical ailments, and reduced accomplishment of work tasks. Recently, the literature has shown that faculty in higher education experience Burnout as do other professions. However, there is limited research documenting the occupational experiences—including the manifestation of Burnout—in counselor educators. Furthermore, a primary theme within the Burnout literature is the struggle to understand the etiology of the construct. Currently, there are two primary theories regarding the etiology of Burnout: (a) external or environmental factors are more responsible in the manifestation of Burnout, and (b) internal factors such as human personality traits or coping styles are more responsible in the manifestation of Burnout.
The purpose of this study was to determine if counselor educators experience
Burnout and to examine the variables associated with it. Specifically, this study
analyzed Burnout against both external and internal variables. A sample consisting of
289 counselor educators teaching in CACREP-accredited programs across the United
States was administered a survey that measured Burnout, Trait Emotional Intelligence
(Trait EI), and demographic variables. Overall, Burnout was low in the sample. There
was a moderate, negative correlation between Burnout and Trait EI. Only two of the
external variables yielded significant relationships to Burnout: academic rank and age.
Tenure status, length of time working as a counselor educator, percentage of work
load teaching, percentage of workload researching, percentage of workload
performing service, gender, religion, and race and ethnic background were all
independent of Burnout. Future research should consider the interchange of both
external factors and internal factors in workers experiencing occupational stress and
Burnout.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Burnout, a problem that relates to an individual's occupation or vocational life, is a prolonged manifestation of emotional exhaustion, cynicism related to work, physical ailments, and reduced accomplishment of work tasks (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001)—the "end result of a process of emotional attrition" (Pines, 2004, p. 66). Since its inception 30 years ago (Freudenberger, 1974), a large amount of evidence confirms that Burnout is a critical issue in the United States workforce. Among counselors, the symptoms of Burnout include frustration, hopelessness, cynicism, physical and emotional fatigue, impairment in effectiveness to help clients, and overall problems with work and life (Kottler, 1993).

Burnout has been studied primarily in the human services professions, particularly in education (Schaufeli, 1998) and nursing (Altun, 2002; Levert, Lucas, & Ortlepp, 2000; Sundin-Huard & Fahy, 1999). Recently the literature has shown an increased focus on Burnout in academic faculty, suggesting that faculty experience Burnout similar to other professions (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Lackritz, 2004; Talbot, 2000). Academic faculty experience multiple demands at work. Specifically, faculty manage heavy teaching loads, committee work, service, and research (Doyle & Hind, 1998). However, to date, there is no research documenting Burnout in counselor
educators. This lack of research is ironic given that wellness is a mandate for the counseling profession (Myers, 1991; Myers, 1992), and that counselor educators have been given a responsibility to integrate Burnout prevention into their curriculum (Savicki & Cooley, 1982; Sowa & May, 1994). A priority, then, is to determine if counselor educators do indeed experience Burnout.

The Burnout construct is relatively young compared with other research constructs. Since the initial establishment of the term (Freudenberger, 1977) the literature reveals that there is still not a solid understanding of the etiology of Burnout. Prominent Burnout scholars believe that it is mainly associated with environmental (i.e., external) variables (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001) such as work environment (Levert et al., 2000; Savicki & Cooley, 1987), supervision (Teasdale, Brocklehurst, & Thorn, 2001), practice setting (Vredenburgh, Carlozzi, & Stein, 1999), and job stress (Kop, Euwema, & Schaufeli, 1999). However, other scholars believe that the focus on external variables has not given a complete understanding of Burnout, hypothesizing that internal variables (i.e., personality characteristics) play a greater role (Bühler & Land, 2003; Pines, 2002; Pines, 2004; Zapf, Seifert, Schmutte, Mertini, & Holz, 2001).

The literature's quantitative studies on external variables still have not provided sufficient understanding of the etiology of Burnout. Therefore, correlative research is still necessary. However, current research should investigate potential relationships between Burnout and internal variables, considering that approximately half of the studies on internal variables show significant correlations with Burnout.
(Lee & Ashforth, 1996). Furthermore, other scholars have provided support for the role of internal variables in Burnout (Bühler & Land, 2003; Pines, 2004).

Finally, the overarching motivation for the study of Burnout is to treat it or to prevent it from even occurring. When scholars can reach an agreement about the etiology of Burnout, there will be a greater ability to develop prevention and intervention programs. Herein lies a crucial fact: If the etiology of Burnout is related to external variables, then the prognosis for treatment is low since most workers do not often have the ability to change their external work environments. Therefore, if associations can be made between Burnout and internal variables, it is more likely that individual workers can change their coping strategies, thereby creating a better prognosis for the alleviation of Burnout.

The purpose of this study is to determine if counselor educators experience Burnout, and, secondly, to examine which variables are associated with it. This study is foundational in that it will provide faculty, administration, and students in counselor education programs insight into the intrapersonal dynamics of counselor educators, and, indeed insight into the Burnout phenomenon itself. The implications of this study are many. It will provide information about the daily occupational experiences within the counselor education profession. It will help professionals gain clarity on the etiology of Burnout, which is essential in establishing empirically valid prevention and intervention programs. And finally, it will supply counselor educators with renewed focus on this topic, thereby assisting them with integrating Burnout prevention programs into counselor education curriculum. This last implication perhaps holds the
greatest significance, for weaving effective Burnout prevention methods during counselors’ graduate training will not only provide students with the tools for personal and professional wellness, but will also benefit the profession by producing counselors who function at the highest of their capabilities.

Rationale

*Burnout: A Problem for the U.S. Workforce*

Research on stress emerged in the mid-20th century, particularly with the work of Hans Selye, who studied the effects of stress on physiological functioning, and Richard Lazarus (1985), who pioneered many of the stress models available today. In the later part of the 20th century, researchers began to focus their work on ways that individuals cope with stressors in order to understand the role that coping has in the manifestation and alleviation of stress. Indeed, Richard Lazarus (2003) himself in his manifesto work stated, “...the arena of stress and emotion...cannot be dealt with adequately without reference to the coping process” (p. 185).

In current times, stress is often exacerbated by one’s occupation. However, there is evidence that the manner in which individuals cope with occupational stress changes according to circumstances, culture, and time. One of the leading scholars in the Burnout field, Ayala Malach Pines (2002), wrote of the “changing psychological contract at work” (p. 11). According to Pines, the psychological contract (defined as the written and unwritten agreements between employee and employer) has evolved in four specific stages over the past two centuries:
The first type is Command → Obey or Unbridled Authority Contract, characteristic of nineteenth century economics and associated with various forms of Social Darwinism and "survival of the fittest" ideology. Control is maintained by suppression to subsistence levels of employees. The second type, characteristic of the early part of the twentieth century, is the Benevolent Autocracy → Loyalty Contract which implies continuous employment given sufficient loyalty. Employee loyalty—determined in terms reliability, minimal competence, compliance, and even docility—constitutes the basic quid pro quo for long-term retention in a system.

The third type, the Continuous Employment given Competence Contract, began somewhere in the 1960's as a result of the shortages of managers and executives caused by war and low birth rates. In this type of contract, [organizations] and selected individuals, especially at the management and executive levels, enter into contracts for long-term or even continuous employment. The fourth type of contract—the Continuous Employability Contract is an emerging creation of recent years. Under the goods of the pace and change of global competition, more or less continuous adaptations are required at all levels of an [organization]. Because organizational survival is often questionable, organizations cannot credibly promise continuous employment, raising substantial issues of confidence and trust between employees and their employing organizations (p. 12).

This evolution of the intrapsychic dynamics of the labor force would naturally suggest that coping methods, as they relate to occupational development, have also been forced to change. Contemporary issues in the labor force—or the Continuous Employability Contract (Pines, 2002)—suggest that today's employees are faced with new occupational stressors. These challenges hold significant implications for how workers cope with occupational stress.

Burnout, which has been characterized as a maladaptive method of coping with occupational stress, was initially thought to be far-fetched and an unlikely occurrence (Farber, 2000a). However, the evidence is overwhelming that Burnout does not only exist, but causes significant problems within the workforce (Pines, 2002). In a routine summary, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics alluded to a phenomenon they
described as "occupational stress," defining it as a neurotic reaction to [work] stress (U.S. Dept of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics Summary, September 1999). According to this summary, workers who reported cases of occupational stress were four times more likely to miss work than workers who suffered from all other nonfatal injuries or illnesses combined. Furthermore, this summary reported that approximately 45% of the workers reporting cases of occupational stress missed on average 31 or more days of work.

It is easy to conclude that over the past 30 years, Burnout has evolved from an implausible phenomenon to a valid research construct. Continued study on the implications of Burnout on the United States labor force, as well as establishing effective treatment for Burnout, is absolutely necessary.

**Burnout: A Problem for Academic Faculty**

The study of Burnout initially began in the helping professions but has spread into almost every profession imaginable (Kop, Euwema & Schaufeli, 1999; Salanova, Peiró & Schaufeli, 2002). However, there has been little research on the occurrence of Burnout in faculty teaching in institutions of higher learning (Lackritz, 2004). The lack of research is ironic, considering that the contemporary professorate has evolved into a highly demanding work environment requiring constant innovation, leadership, organization, effective instructional delivery, and advancing technology skills (Evans, 2001). As early as 1980, it was documented that faculty members face many challenges, such as conflicts with administration, high work demands (pressure to
carry a significant teaching and advising loads while still producing publishable research), students who are apathetic about learning, large class sizes, and a sense of pressure due to the changing nature of institution finances (Lenthall, 1980).

Researchers now believe that the study of Burnout in higher education faculty is timely given that few studies have appeared in the literature, and that the multiple demands of the professorate warrant increased inquiry within this population (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Lackritz, 2004; Jackson & Simpson, 2001; Talbot, 2000).

Recent research indicates that academic faculty do experience Burnout. Lackritz's (2004) in-depth study of 265 university faculty members estimated that 20% of the sample experienced Burnout. Emmerik (2002) hypothesized that the demands of the academic setting make faculty more susceptible to the emotional exhaustion component of Burnout and found that assistance with coping with work demands helped decrease emotional exhaustion, especially in female faculty. Talbot (2000) found similar results in her study of community college nursing faculty; this study indicated that 40% of the sample experienced Burnout overall, and 73% of the sample experienced greater degrees of reduced personal accomplishment.

Earlier research also substantiates the idea that faculty in higher education experience burnout. Singh, Mishra, and Kim's (1998) study of 328 faculty members found associations between Burnout and the job task of research. A study by Doyle and Hind (1998) of university psychology faculty indicated that the Burnout components of emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment were present within the sample. Pretorius's (1994) study of 94 faculty members teaching in
a university in South Africa confirmed relationships between Burnout and organizational variables such as role conflict, role ambiguity, number of students taught, and lack of participation in decision making. This latter study is interesting given the author's description of challenges that this sample faced due to the geographical location of the university. Issues such as racial tension and low morale were factors in this sample, raising questions about the role of cultural issues in the manifestation of Burnout.

These studies, while claiming just a small portion of the Burnout literature, strongly suggest that faculty in institutions of higher learning do experience Burnout like other occupations within the labor force. Therefore, continued inquiry on the relationships of Burnout with faculty in institutions of higher learning is essential.

**Burnout: An Issue in Counselor Education?**

“Counselor Education,” a term that refers to the graduate training and education of professional counselors, is a relatively young profession. In fact, the broader field of counseling itself was not well established until early in the 20th century, when guidance counseling icon Frank Parsons and psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud began gaining recognition for their work. The advent of the United States Congress National Education Defense Act in 1958 fully initiated the development of counselor education, mostly due to the emphasis of the United States government on
training qualified school counselors to assist young students with career and academic achievement. These events are a few examples of how the counselor education profession has been shaped.

Throughout the past century, the counselor education field has established itself as a profession with unique characteristics. For example, professional affiliation is a distinction of the field (Magnuson, Wilcoxon & Norem, 2003; Sweeney, 1992), particularly as it relates to program accreditation. The most prestigious program accreditation is CACREP (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs), which sets the highest standards for excellence among counselor education programs (Sweeney, 1992). Programs that hold the CACREP accreditation are assumed to be pedagogically sound, producing extremely well trained counselors that enhance the profession and overall dignity of human beings.

Since the early 1960s, the counselor education profession has been developing, and only recently has reached a point of stabilization (Hazler & Carney, 1993; Maples & Macari, 1998). Not surprisingly then, there is a paucity of the literature regarding the career development issues of counselor educators. Examining the career development of this population is crucial, since the profession has a history of shortages of counselor educators, particularly of women and people of color (Hazler & Carney, 1993). Understanding the characteristics and career development issues of counselor educators is necessary for maintaining the longevity and strength of the profession.
Characteristics of counselor educators. Counselor educators are professional faculty who instruct graduate level courses in counseling. They most often have a Master's degree in counseling as well as a doctorate in counselor education and supervision, or other counseling-related doctorate (i.e., counseling psychology). Counselor educators also have expertise in a specialization of counseling, such as community agencies, K-12 schools, college and university settings, mental health counseling, and rehabilitation counseling.

Counselor educators share similar personal and professional characteristics. A recent qualitative study (Magnuson et al., 2003) exploring the career paths of leaders within the counseling profession found similar themes in personal values, such as wanting to "give back" and a desire to help others. The participants also noted consistency in having a passion for the counseling profession, as well as having models that encouraged them in their career pursuits. A strong sense of professional identity was also present in the sample. (Professional identity refers to pride in identifying as a "counselor" or "counselor educator").

One unique characteristic within the profession is that personal growth is deemed to be as important as professional development. According to CACREP standards, counselors-in-training must be evaluated in personal development as well as in academic and professional development. While the literature still does not reflect consistency as to the specific definition of "personal development," it has been
suggested that qualities such as empathy, maturity, openness, flexibility, awareness of impact on others, counseling skills, and ability to accept personal responsibility are essential (Hensley, Smith, & Thompson, 2003).

Multiculturalism and counselor education. Among the most noteworthy movements in the counselor education field is the emphasis on multiculturalism. In the early 1990s, the counselor education profession began to shift with the introduction of research on multicultural issues in counseling (Sue & Arredondo, 1992). Practicing as a “culturally competent counselor” and multicultural counseling has become a much-needed theme that is woven throughout graduate coursework.

While the past 15 years have yielded progress in multicultural counseling practice, much more work needs to be done within the profession itself. In their article on the status report of hiring trends in counselor education, Maples and Macari (1998) stated that in the late 1990s new counselor educator hires of women and people of color have increased, but white male faculty continue to hold more positions and positions of higher rank. Brinson and Kottler (1993) stated that recruiting and retaining faculty who identify with underrepresented groups is critical to the counselor education profession, which can happen through mentoring faculty and students of color.

Multicultural identity can impact a counselor educator’s occupational functioning. In a recent article on her personal experiences of being an African American counselor educator, Beth Durodoye described a feeling of “tiredness” from being misunderstood by colleagues and students (Durodoye, 1999). Durodoye wrote
of both overt and covert racism within the profession, and how this racism impacted her personal and professional development. Her story demonstrates that the counseling and counselor education professions alike still have work to do in eliminating racism and promoting social justice.

Is Burnout an issue for counselor educators? Durodoye’s (1999) article described a feeling of “tiredness,” a feeling which has also been associated with occupational Burnout. Despite the recent interest in examining Burnout within university faculty, the counselor education literature has been slow to respond. However, two recent studies do show some potential for alleviating the present deficit in the literature. A study on new assistant professors of counselor education illustrated that this population can experience high degrees of stress and anxiety, as well as feelings of disappointment and regret (Magnuson, 2002). This study also found that stress and anxiety could be potentially mediated through the mentorship of a senior faculty mentor or a similar kind of support. Another recent study on the sense of well being of counselor educators (Leinbaugh, Hazler, Bradley & Hill, 2003) found that variables such as organizational control, internal control and rewards, and time and effort management were positively correlated with personal happiness. This study suggested that counselor educators do feel satisfaction in their careers, but this satisfaction comes from a sense of personal autonomy (which may not occur, given the demanding nature of most academic settings). This study also noted that issues such as racial bias, gender bias, and ambiguity regarding the tenure and promotion
process may negatively affect a counselor educator’s sense of well being (Leinbaugh et al., 2003). These two studies lend credence to the necessity for further inquiry with this sample, especially in the areas of career development and multicultural counseling.

Perhaps the most compelling argument for studying Burnout in counselor educators is the mandate for wellness within the profession. Wellness, a critical piece for functioning as a physically and psychologically healthy individual, is a theme woven throughout the counseling profession from the first day of graduate training until the day of retirement. The wellness theme can be traced as far back as 1960s, when Gilbert Wrenn (1962) stated in his keystone book *The Counselor in a Changing World*:

> Although not part of any official curriculum, the graduate faculty in counselor education should give attention to the need for personal psychological growth of graduate students in this field. The counselor as a person is the most important single factor in counseling. He needs to understand himself psychologically in order to be effective in helping others (p. 168).

In the early 1990s, wellness was heralded as a “paradigm for counseling” (Myers, 1991) and the “cornerstone of the [counseling] profession” (Myers, 1992). In this latter article, Myers (1992) examined the American Counseling Association’s commitment for counselor wellness and called for more strategies to focus on prevention of mental health issues (rather than on intervention), particularly in light of the third-party health management movement. These works clearly demonstrate that practicing wellness is utterly foundational to the counseling profession.
Ironically, Burnout, which can reasonably be considered an antecedent to wellness, has not been an empirical priority within the counselor education research. A possible explanation for this silence is the initial fear that Burnout was the fault of individual counselors, or a reflection of counselors' inability to manage work stress. At the crux of the Burnout movement, literature was published addressing this issue. Charles Warnath's (1979) article, "Counselor Burnout: Existential Crisis or a Problem for the Profession?", shared that counselors "expressed relief that we have put into writing an experience they have been unable to share with colleagues for fear of being judged as professional failures" (p. 325). Warnath alluded to Burnout being a taboo subject within the counseling profession due to fear experienced by counselors as being thought of as "failures" if they experienced Burnout. According to Warnath (1979), the critical issue of the counseling profession at that time was that counselors seemed to be "reluctant to discuss what they perceived to be discrepancies between their expectations and the realities of their work situation because of their fear that their colleagues will attribute their discomfort to their personal inadequacies or professional deficiencies" (p. 325). In an article directed to counselor educators discussing implications of the Burnout research, Savicki and Cooley (1982) echoed this same theme stating that, "...Burnout should be studied as a phenomenon of the profession rather than as a result of individual fault or defect" (p. 415). Thus, perhaps some of the lack of empirical study on Burnout within the counselor education literature is a reflection of this misperception.
Several mandates to address Burnout in the training of student counselors have been given to counselor educators throughout the years (Davis, Savicki, Cooley, & Firth, 1989; Savicki & Cooley, 1982; Sowa & May, 1994; Witmer & Young, 1996). However, a review of these publications suggests that Burnout was more of a priority in the earlier stages of the research and has only briefly been touched upon in the counselor education field since then. To further substantiate this point, a recent database search of prominent journals in the counseling field (i.e. Journal of Counseling & Development; Counselor Education and Supervision) yields no results for the search term “Burnout.”

The lack of literature on Burnout in the counselor education field draws out a critical issue. What implications does this paucity of the literature hold in regard to the training of counselors? Is Burnout prevention even being addressed in the classroom, or is it being addressed effectively? Furthermore, how does the integration of Burnout prevention into counselor education curriculum (or lack thereof) affect counselors when they are working professionally?

It is clear from the literature that Burnout is a critical issue for most professions and is therefore a likely issue for counselors and counselor educators. The lack of empirical study on Burnout in counselors and counselor educators is a grave oversight on the part of the profession. If we establish a priority to investigate Burnout within the counselor education field—including the occurrence of Burnout within counselor educators themselves—we are making an important leap into understanding the role of Burnout within the counseling profession as a whole.
Research Questions

The research questions for the present study have emerged from the literature. Now, more than ever, faculty members in institutions of higher education are faced with significant work demands (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Evans, 2001). Indeed, counselor educators are no exception (Leinbaugh et al., 2003). Counselor educators may be more susceptible to Burnout than professors of other disciplines, in that counseling deals with problems related to human functioning. A recent study on new assistant professors of counselor education (Magnuson, 2002) indicated that this population experiences a great deal of stress in their jobs, raising questions about the propensity for counselor educators to experience Burnout. Furthermore, the climate of counselor education can be filled with multiple challenges (Durodoye, 1999; Leinbaugh et al., 2003). Therefore, the first research question is “To what degree do counselor educators experience Burnout?”

Despite the strong research emphasis on external variables, evidence exists that internal variables share significant relationships with Burnout (Bühler & Land, 2003; Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Pines, 2000; Pines, 2002; Zapf et al., 2001). Therefore, a contemporary human characteristic, Trait Emotional Intelligence (Trait EI), was chosen as the internal variable. There have been a few previous studies that resulted in significant relationships between Burnout and Emotional Intelligence (Kohan, 2002; Mendez, 2002); however, these studies did not measure Trait EI. At the present time, there are no known studies that investigate a relationship between Burnout and Trait EI. As a validated personality characteristic (Petrides & Furnham, 2001; Saklofske,
Austin, & Minkski, 2003), as well as support that Trait EI shares relationships with positive coping styles (Furnham, Petrides, & Spencer-Bowdage, 2002; Furnham, Petrides, Sisterson, & Baluch, 2003), a study that investigates a potential relationship between Burnout and Trait EI may lend more insight into the etiology of Burnout. Moreover, if there is an inverse relationship between Burnout and Trait EI, it is predicted that the field will gain more perception into developing prevention and intervention strategies. Therefore, the second research question is “Does Trait EI share a significant, negative relationship with Burnout?” The third research question is “Do demographic characteristics (external variables) share more significant, positive relationships with Burnout than Trait EI (internal variables)?

Definition of Terms

**Ability emotional intelligence (Ability EI):** A cognitively acquired or learned characteristic that is measured through outside report (Petrides & Furnham, 2001).

**Burnout:** A prolonged and pervasive manifestation of symptomatology consisting of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, reduced personal accomplishment, and physical and mental fatigue. Burnout stems from one’s occupation, causing significant impairment in workers’ personal and professional lives. It is important to note that Burnout is not “stress”—which is the environmental pressure of the daily work experience, nor is it “depression”—which is the manifestation of symptomatology that originates from a non work-related phenomenon.
Counselor educators: Professional faculty (i.e., adjunct professor, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, professor emeritus) who teach graduate level counseling courses.

Counselor education programs: Graduate programs that train professional counselors (e.g., school counselors, mental health counselors, community agency counselors, marriage and family therapists, community college counselors and career counselors).

Depersonalization: A sense of cynicism about things that a worker would not ordinarily be cynical about, such as clients or the work environment; a detached attitude towards one’s job (Maslach & Schaufeli, 2001). Depersonalization is one of the subscales on the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

Emotional exhaustion: A feeling of emotional overload and depletion (Taris, Schreurs, & Schaufeli, 1999) that is not resolved despite physical rest. Emotional exhaustion is one of the subscales on the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

Emotional intelligence: “A type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990, p. 189). Emotional intelligence has been associated with success in work, career and interpersonal relationships (Goleman, 1995).

External variables: Variables that are outside workers’ control, such as work environment, job requirements, or supervision.
Internal variables: Variables related to human characteristics, such as attitude, perceptions, or personality.

Personal accomplishment: An ability to complete work tasks or be productive at work. “Reduced personal accomplishment” refers to a decline in one’s ability to complete tasks. Personal accomplishment is one of the subscales on the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

Trait emotional intelligence (Trait EI): A human characteristic that is measured through self-report (Petrides & Furnham, 2001).
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Burnout: History of the Construct

*Establishing Construct Validity*

The term “Burnout” originated in the mid 1970s from Manhattan psychoanalyst Herbert J. Freudenberger (Freudenberger, 1974, 1977). Freudenberger established the term after observing multiple clients who repeatedly expressed feelings of emotional and physical fatigue, irritability, and cynicism about their occupations. According to Freudenberger (1977), the etiology of such symptoms stemmed from occupational stress, manifesting through prolonged and pervasive symptomatology.

Early thought on Burnout initially conceptualized it to be a negative adaptation to occupational stress. Many scholars wrestled with the term, finding it difficult to agree on a definition. “Different people used the term to mean very different things, so there was not always a basis for constructive communication and solutions for it” (Maslach et al., 2001, p. 402). In the early 1980s, Freudenberger noted a need for a collective definition. He voiced concern that the “overuse” or “overextension” of the construct could render the term meaningless (Freudenberger, 1983).

In the early 1980s, a social psychologist named Christina Maslach began investigating Burnout. She believed that Burnout manifested itself as a multidimensional phenomenon with three underlying components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment (Maslach, 1982).
“Emotional exhaustion” refers to feeling emotionally overwhelmed and depleted (Taris et al., 1999). “Depersonalization” refers to a sense of cynicism about things that one would not ordinarily be cynical about (i.e. clients or one’s own work). “Reduced personal accomplishment,” refers to a decline in one’s ability to complete tasks. Although other scholars have proposed different definitions of burnout (Farber, 2000a; Pines, 2002), Maslach’s definition remains the standard within the academic literature (Maslach et al., 2001).

Despite the establishment of a definition of Burnout, confusion continued to exist about the phenomenon (Maslach et al., 2001; Meier, 1984). Many of the symptoms of Burnout mirrored symptoms of depression. Furthermore, terms such as “stress,” “occupational stress” and later “compassion fatigue” were used interchangeably with the term “Burnout.” Differentiating between Burnout and these terms was necessary for gaining an accurate conception of the phenomenon.

Approximately 10 years after the establishment of the term “Burnout,” a study examining the construct validity of Burnout was successful in establishing convergent validity (Meier, 1984). Data were collected from a sample of university faculty using several measures of Burnout, depression, and self-ratings. The study showed strong convergent validity among all of the Burnout measures, indicating strong support for the construct. However, the results were weaker in establishing discriminant validity between Burnout and depression. The author hypothesized that this finding was due to the similarity of the Burnout experience with a depression experience—that is, both are feeling states and therefore an individual may have difficulty differentiating
between them (Meier, 1984). Recent research on the discriminant validity between Burnout and depression supports Meier’s (1984) explanation, in that Burnout and depression share many of the same characteristics but are actually different phenomena (Iacovides, Fountoulakis, Kaprinis, & Kaprinis, 2003; Shirom & Ezrachi, 2003). These latter studies have shown stronger discriminant validity between Burnout and depression. Furthermore, Burnout is related solely to one’s occupation, whereas the etiology of depression stems from psychosocial and physiological stimuli (Maslach et al., 2001).

The term that is most often interchanged with Burnout is “stress.” However, these two terms are “two very different concepts with very different etiologies” (Pines, 2002, p. 13). The term “stress” refers to a relationship between a person and the environment (Lazarus, 1990). Key elements of stress include an attribution by an individual experiencing stress—that is, an individual must label a situation as “stressful.” Common understanding in the stress literature conceptualized stress as a pattern that includes an activating event appraised by an individual, which then results in either positive or negative coping. According to this definition, “occupational stress” would therefore be the occurrence of negative stimuli prompted by one’s occupation or work setting.

A term that has emerged in the past decade—“compassion fatigue” or secondary traumatic stress—is also often confused with Burnout. Again, these constructs are very different. Compassion fatigue refers to the vicarious traumatization of individuals who work with clients who have experienced trauma (Figley, 2002;
In contrast, Burnout is associated with a maladaptive reaction to occupational stress rather than the exposure to specific client issues (i.e., traumatic events).

In the past 30 years, the study of Burnout has evolved from vague theoretical conceptualizations to the establishment of a valid research construct. Burnout is a phenomenon of prolonged and pervasive manifestation of symptomatology consisting of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, reduced personal accomplishment, and physical and mental fatigue (Maslach & Schaufeli, 2001; Pines, 2004). Burnout stems from one’s occupation, and causes significant impairment in a worker’s personal and professional life. It is neither “stress,” “depression,” nor “compassion fatigue,” but rather a distinct construct that holds importance for further inquiry.

*Measuring Burnout*

Throughout the construct validation of Burnout, the development of a measurement method became necessary. The first measure was developed in 1981 by Christina Maslach and Susan Jackson. This instrument, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach & Jackson, 1981) or MBI, is the most commonly used instrument in the Burnout field (Pines, 2005; Schaufeli, Bakker, Hoogduin, Schaap, & Kladler, 2001; Shirom & Ezrachi, 2003). The MBI measures the three components of Burnout (Maslach, 1982) in three subscales. The MBI rates 22 items in an ordinal fashion that are also analyzed for intensity and frequency. Internal consistency reliabilities are .90
for Emotional Exhaustion, .79 for Depersonalization, and .71 for Personal Accomplishment with test-retest reliability coefficients of the same at .82, .60, and .80 (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In recent years, new versions of the MBI (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996) were developed to include human services professionals (MBI-HSS or MBI-Human Services Survey), educators (MBI-ES or MBI-Educators Survey), and, more recently, general occupations (MBI-GS or MBI-General Survey). The MBI has been translated into many languages and has been used in many countries (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993).

Another quantitative instrument was developed in the late 1980s by Pines and Aronson (1988), although it is not as commonly reflected in the literature. This instrument is referred to as the Burnout Measure (BM). The BM is structured much like the MBI; the BM is a self-report measure with 21 items assessing physical, mental and emotional exhaustion (Pines, 2002). The authors reported internal consistency coefficients above .90 with high stability on test-retest coefficients. The BM has been used in many countries and has been translated into many different languages (Pines, 2002). Recently, researchers have shown validation of the BM (Schaufeli, Bakker, et al., 2001; Shirom & Ezrachi, 2003), and it has been shortened into the Burnout Measure-Short Form (BMS) to meet the needs of researchers (Pines, 2005).
Trends in the Literature

Samples. The Burnout construct was first introduced in the helping professions; more specifically, Freudenberger developed the term after observing this phenomenon among substance abuse therapists. Therefore, it is no surprise that most of the early research included samples within the human services professions. It is estimated that approximately one-fourth of all research samples consist of educators (Schaufeli, 1998). Samples drawn from the field of nursing are also common (Altun, 2002; Levert et al., 2000; Sundin-Huard & Fahy, 1999). Interestingly, research samples of counselors or counselor educators are not as common. A recent database search of prominent journals in the counseling field (i.e., Journal of Counseling & Development, and Counselor Education and Supervision) revealed no results for the search terms “Burnout,” “Maslach Burnout Inventory,” or “Burnout Measure.”

Throughout the past decade, the study of Burnout has begun to focus on a variety of professions. For example, recent research has included samples of information technology workers (Salanova, Peiró, & Schaufeli, 2002), as well as banking and customer service workers (Zapf et al., 2001). This research is likely the result of the development of the MBI-GS or MBI-General Survey for professionals not affiliated with human services (Maslach, Jackson, & Schaufeli, 1996). The expansion of the original MBI has afforded researchers the ability to reliably measure the Burnout phenomenon within a diverse workforce, rather than simply isolating study to the helping professions.
The struggle to understand etiology. A primary theme within the Burnout literature is the struggle to understand etiology of the construct. Pines (2000) stated, “One of the major controversies among scholars who study Burnout centers on the question of its underlying causes” (p. 633). Some of the most well-known scholars believe that Burnout is a social phenomenon, caused by environmental, organizational, or external variables (Maslach et al., 2001). However, other scholars argue that Burnout is related to internal characteristics, such as personality or coping styles (Bühler & Land, 2003; Pines, 2004; Zapf et al., 2001).

To date, the literature has been driven by attempts to understand the etiology of Burnout. Consequently, research methodologies within the Burnout literature have been primarily quantitative. The early availability of measures likely afforded researchers the ability to study Burnout through a positivist paradigm (Maslach et al., 2001). Scholars have primarily engaged in correlational studies in an effort to understand variables associated with the phenomenon (Maslach & Schaufeli, 1993). Although, more recently, scholars have attempted to provide a qualitative focus in their research (Pines, 2002; Sundin-Huard & Fahy, 1999), phenomenological and mixed methodologies have been limited.

Notwithstanding, the past 30 years of research, researchers have not fully established the etiology of Burnout. Indeed, the literature reflects the continued dispute of whether Burnout is caused by external variables or internal variables. Well-known Burnout researchers, Christina Maslach, Michael P. Leiter and Wilmar B. Schaufeli (2001), believe that Burnout is rooted in external variables:
Several individual [internal] characteristics have been found to be related to Burnout. However, these relationships are not as great in size as those for Burnout and situational [external] variables, which suggests that Burnout is more of a social phenomenon than a personal one (p. 409).

Consequently, the literature historically reflects a great number of correlational studies attempting to relate Burnout to external variables.

Despite the principal argument that Burnout is related to external variables, many scholars disagree. Ayala Malach Pines (2000, 2002), another prominent Burnout researcher, believes that Burnout is related to psychodynamic and existential issues. Indeed, Herbert Freudenberger (1980), the “father” of the Burnout construct, believed that Burnout was related to unfulfilled expectations of a personal nature. Recent scholars believe that most empirical studies to date have not measured the interaction of internal variables to the detriment of fully understanding the etiology of the construct (Zapf et al., 2001).

The strong research focus on external variables is exemplified in a meta analysis of occupational Burnout correlates (Lee & Ashforth, 1996). The authors analyzed all studies (N = 61) using the MBI from the years 1982 (one year after the MBI was developed) and 1994 (the year the authors completed the meta-analysis). From the 61 studies analyzed, 33 variables were extracted and analyzed for correlations. Of these 33 variables, 27 were external variables. Only six of the variables focused on internal variables. What is noteworthy about the Lee and Ashforth study is that the authors found significant correlations in half of the external variables and half of the internal variables. This finding implies that internal variables may have just as much of a role in the etiology of Burnout as external variables.
Current and future issues. From the mid 1970s to the mid 1990s, scholars produced research that examined Burnout through a reductionist lens in order to understand the construct. Consequently, much of the literature within that time period reflected quantitative research and theoretical pieces. In 1997, scholars introduced a new concept—occupational “engagement”—which was initially thought to be the antecedent of Burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Similar to Burnout, engagement contains three components: energy, involvement, and efficiency. Scholars began studying the new construct of engagement (Schaufeli, Salanova, González-Romá, & Bakker, 2001) but soon began to identify engagement as a totally separate construct (Strümpfer, 2003). Despite this recent differentiation in the engagement and Burnout constructs, continued study of engagement may increase understanding of Burnout.

Conceivably, the most crucial issue in the study of Burnout is the management or total alleviation of the phenomenon. However, finding a treatment or “cure” for Burnout has proven difficult, since scholars have not been able to agree upon its etiology. Scholars have proposed many forms of treatment, such as cognitive-behavioral approaches (Farber, 2000a; Hatfield & Hatfield, 1992), changing one’s environment (Farber, 2000b), skills training and stress management techniques (Rowe, 2000), holistic wellness approaches (Kesler, 1990), and even discovering one’s existential expectations through a therapeutic process (Pines, 2000). Though these solutions appear to be common sensical, they still do not provide an empirically grounded treatment modality. Establishing a treatment will likely occur when scholars are certain about the etiology of the phenomenon.
In the past 30 years, the knowledge about Burnout has expanded through the research. However, scholars still cannot agree on the most fundamental principle—the etiology of the construct. In essence, the question “What causes Burnout?” remains. “Do external variables or internal variables play more of a role in the manifestation of Burnout?” Answering these questions is crucial before advances can be made in treatment and systemic change. Thus, the literature review on the major construct of this study (Burnout) focuses on variables that share relationships with or correlate with Burnout.

Correlates of Burnout

A database search was completed to review the literature on Burnout. Queried databases included PsychInfo, the aggregated databases of EBSCOhost, OCLC First Search and Dissertations Abstracts International. Literature search terms included “Burnout,” “occupational stress,” “stress,” “compassion fatigue,” “Maslach Burnout Inventory,” and “Burnout Measure.” Congruent to the purpose of this dissertation, delimiters were established for studies that only considered variables sharing relationships with Burnout. Additionally, studies that were not methodologically sound or current (within the past 15 years) were eliminated. For the other constructs within this dissertation, search terms included “faculty,” “academics,” “higher education,” “counselor educators,” “counselors,” “emotional intelligence,” “trait emotional intelligence,” “construct validity,” and “multicultural.”
Correlates with External Variables

Demographic characteristics. Demographic characteristics are included in most of the scholarly studies to date; however, researchers have had difficulty establishing solid relationships between demographics and Burnout. Since demographic variables represent a major construct of the present study, an in-depth review begins on page 42.

Preparation for career. While a somewhat minor and surprising variable, poor preparation for one’s career emerged as associated with a susceptibility for experiencing Burnout later in an individual’s professional life. In their study of public school teachers, Gold and Bachelor (2001) found that teachers who reported poor quality of teacher training courses experienced emotional exhaustion. This sample also showed a positive, significant correlation between reported lack of preparation to deal with student discipline problems and emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment. Based on their results, Gold and Bachelor surmised that poor preparation for a teaching career may have produced more stress and dissatisfaction in the teaching profession, which may have contributed to the sample’s Burnout.

Work environment. Within the scholarly literature, the work environment is thought to be the main variable perpetuating occupational Burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997; Strümpfer, 2003). Therefore, researchers have consistently attempted to establish relationships between Burnout and work environment. It is likely that this research is a result of scholars attempting to understand the etiology of the construct.
Regardless of why this research approach has occurred, it does provide some evidence for a link between environmental variables and the occurrence of Burnout.

Although the study of Burnout originated in and centered upon the helping professions, there is no evidence that different occupations within the helping professions have more or less propensity for experiencing Burnout. Occupations such as nursing, psychiatry, social work, and teaching all report the same vulnerability for Burnout (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Elman & Dowd, 1997; Lert, Chastang, & Castono, 2001; Thornton, 1992). Thornton’s (1992) study, however, found that mental health workers in inpatient settings reported more Burnout than mental health workers in outpatient settings. Within the medical profession, physician standing was also not an indicator of the tendency to experience Burnout (Lert et al., 2001).

Employment demands have been strongly speculated to play a significant role in occupational Burnout. Several recent studies have successfully established relationships between Burnout and high workloads. A study of Dutch information technology workers found that job overload significantly and positively correlated with emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment (Salanova et al., 2002). Coffey and Coleman (2001) found that nurses in England reported a positive correlation between caseload size and emotional exhaustion. Pomaki and Anagnostopoulou (2003) found that Burnout was associated with job demands in Greek teachers. Similarly, Lert et al. (2001) found significant and positive correlations between emotional exhaustion and workload with physicians. Despite these promising results, the literature has not able to fully establish a link between Burnout and
employment demands. Lert et al. (2001) failed to find a correlation in his research between Burnout and time constraints on the job. Another recent study yielded no correlations between patient load and Burnout in the nursing profession (Hayter, 1999).

Two studies have established a correlation between grief and loss on the job and Burnout. Hayter (1999) found that nurses who experienced the death of patients often experienced grief and loss, which was a predictor of emotional exhaustion. Visintini and Campanini (1996) found that grief and loss in nurses working with patients with infectious diseases correlated with all three components of Burnout. The authors speculated that grief and loss was a result of their subjects’ likelihood of developing strong relationships with patients who could ultimately die, which could then affect their subjects’ sense of career competency.

Congruent with the strong research focus on employment demands, job tasks have also been thought to be associated with Burnout. Job tasks that increase stress or that require behaviors outside cultural norms have shown relationships with Burnout. For example, Dutch police officers who were required to use violence in working with criminals reported significant and positive correlations with all three components of Burnout. A study that included multiple professions (helping professions, banking and customer service) also revealed significant and positive correlations between job requirements (i.e., dealing with job complexity, organizational problems, concentration necessities, task-related stressors, and organizational-related stressors) and emotional exhaustion and depersonalization (Zapf et al., 2001). Similarly,
physicians who reported giving suboptimal patient care also reported high depersonalization of patients (Shanafelt, Bradley, Wipf, & Back, 2002). On the other hand, job activities were not found to have any correlation with Burnout with physicians caring for Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) patients (Lert et al., 2001).

Perhaps the strongest links in the literature between Burnout and environmental variables is found in job rewards (or lack thereof). Lert et al. (2001) found that peer and institution esteem of physicians correlated negatively with reduced personal accomplishment. Rewards such as job security (Coffey & Coleman, 2001) and job control (Salanova et al., 2002) have established negative correlations with emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment. Finally, in a study of Dutch police officers, Kop et al. (1999) found that officers who reported a lack of reciprocity (i.e., investment of energy) from the community and the community employer correlated positively with Burnout in general.

Researchers have also attempted to understand the role of supervision within Burnout, with promising results. That is, workers who perceive their supervision as positive and adequate report lower levels of Burnout. A study that measured nurses' access to clinical supervision found that nurses who had limited or no access to clinical supervision reported significant and positive correlations to reduced personal accomplishment (Teasdale et al., 2001). The authors surmised that their results suggested that the supervised group may experience greater feelings of competence and successful achievement. An unsupportive manager or supervisor was also linked
with Burnout in English forensic community mental health nurses (Coffey & Coleman, 2001). These results are compatible with an earlier study in the counseling field, which theorized that counselors could alleviate Burnout through the clinical supervision process (Davis et al., 1989).

Larger environment. Researchers have also attempted to understand if a worker’s larger environment contributes to Burnout. For example, some researchers believe the amount of social support that workers have will predict the amount of Burnout that these individuals will experience. Pines (1983), one of the leading Burnout scholars, postulated the notion that social support acts as a stress buffer to workers. This theory is substantiated by Elman and Dowd’s (1997) research of inpatient substance abuse therapists, which found that social support correlated negatively with reduced personal accomplishment. Similarly, Pomaki and Anagnostopoulou (2003) found that Burnout was negatively associated with social support. Lert et al. (2001) found that stress related to personal relationships at work significantly and positively correlated with emotional exhaustion; this study also found that depersonalization “is increased by an elevated level of stress due to social relationships at work” (p. 771). Similarly, peer relationships have been found to be a contributor of Burnout (Hayter, 1999; Visintini & Campanini, 1996), as has personal stress (Elman & Dowd, 1997).

Social perceptions of an individual’s particular profession have also been found to play a part in Burnout. Social recognition and reward have shown negative correlations with Burnout. Hayter’s (1999) study found that nurses who perceived
more recognition for their work reported higher levels of personal accomplishment. This study also found that nurses who experienced stigma and discrimination about working with Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) victims reported emotional exhaustion (Hayter, 1999). Visintini and Campanini’s (1996) study of nurses working with patients who had infectious diseases found negative correlations between emotional exhaustion and depersonalization.

*Correlates with Internal Variables*

Throughout the history of the literature, fewer studies have focused on attempting to establish a link between Burnout and internal variables. However, more recently, researchers have attempted to investigate these relationships, with promising results.

*Personality characteristics.* Although the confluence of personality characteristics and Burnout have not been a primary focus of the literature, some researchers are now starting to believe that personality may affect the manifestation of Burnout more than previously thought (Bühler & Land, 2003; Tselebis, Moulou, & Ilias, 2001). A recent study of intensive care nurses in Germany found that Burnout was significantly related to certain aspects of personality (Bühler & Land, 2003). The authors administered the Maslach Burnout Inventory and several personality assessments and found significant correlations between the components of Burnout and various personality characteristics. The most significant predictors of various Burnout components were neuroticism, extraversion, external locus of control, job
distance inability, existential frustration, and ability of love. Another study of professional nurses (Tselebis et al., 2001) found that sense of coherence negatively correlated with all three Burnout components.

A recent study of the relationship between Burnout and attachment styles yielded a negative correlation between Burnout and secure attachment styles, as well as a positive correlation between Burnout and insecure attachment styles (Pines, 2004). This study was particularly interesting since the author replicated the study several times in various occupations and cultures and found similar results. Self-efficacy has also been studied to some extent regarding its relationship to Burnout. A study of Dutch information technology workers revealed that self-efficacy about ability to work with computers (a major job function) negatively correlated with emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment (Salanova et al., 2002).

Another contemporary personality characteristic, emotional intelligence, has also started to find a niche in the literature. In their doctoral dissertations, Kohan (2002) and Mendez (2002) both found that emotional intelligence was negatively associated with Burnout.

Existential issues. While slightly dated, two researchers found a correlation between existential issues and Burnout (Yiu-kee & Tang, 1995). “Existential issues” are defined as a motivation to seek purpose in an individual’s career as a mental health worker (Hong Kong), which theoretically related to one’s perceived purpose in life. Yiu-kee & Tang (1995) found that motivation to seek purpose was positively correlated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, and that purpose in life
was negatively correlated with reduced personal accomplishment. Pines (2002) found similar results in her study of psychodynamic existential motivations for choosing a career in teaching and Burnout in Israeli teachers. Indeed, much of Pines's research focused on an existential and psychodynamic link with Burnout (1993, 2000a, 2002).

**Values.** Some researchers have found a connection between personal values and Burnout. Altun’s (2002) study of nurses in Turkey found significant and positive correlations between emotional exhaustion and the values of equality, altruism, and desire for aesthetics. Based on these findings, the recommendation was that nurses should examine their personal and professional beliefs before entering and while in the nursing profession, as some personal values may be more likely to be affected by Burnout. Sundin-Huard and Fahy’s (1999) study of moral distress over patient scenarios in nursing found similar results: Nurses who value optimal patient care may experience distress when optimal patient care is not possible, which eventually leads to Burnout. Conversely, a study that compared Burnout levels in two groups of teachers with different philosophies regarding teaching children with Autism found no significant difference in Burnout between two groups identifying with different teaching philosophies (Jennett, Harris, & Mesibov, 2003).

**Perceptions.** A worker's perceptions could be affiliated with Burnout; that is, workers who generally perceive their situation as positive may not experience as much Burnout as workers who have more negative perceptions. Indeed, this theme was first introduced by Freudenberger (1980) as he posited that Burnout is caused by unfulfilled expectations. Therefore, workers who perceived their work life to be a
particular way experienced disappointment when faced with the realities of the job, which then eventually led to Burnout. Friedman (2000) echoed this theme in his recent piece on Burnout in teachers.

Friedman’s earlier work showed a correlation between perceived professional satisfaction and Burnout in teachers (Friedman & Farber, 1992). This study also showed a correlation between self-concept in teaching dealing with the teacher’s sense of self, and the teacher’s sense of students’, administrators’, and parents’ perceptions of the teacher’s work. In the nursing field, Sundin-Huard and Fahy (1999) attempted to establish a link between a nurses’ advocacy for patients; that is, nurses who perceived that their advocacy for patients produced unfruitful results were more likely to burn out.

Coping strategies. The coping style or strategies of workers may play a significant role in the manifestation of Burnout. An early study (Thornton, 1992) showed that emotion-focused coping, namely escape-avoidance coping, significantly and positively correlated with all three component of Burnout in professional mental health workers. More recent studies have also substantiated this finding (Emmerik, 2002). Some researchers have considered emotion work (the requirement to display organizationally-required emotions at work) and emotional dissonance, and their relationships to Burnout (Zapf et al., 2001). Their results suggest that when workers are required to cope or to express emotions in a manner that is personally incongruent, they may be more prone to experiencing Burnout. In a study by Pomaki and Anagnostopoulou (2003), Greek teachers found that task-oriented coping was a
predictor of depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment, and emotion-oriented coping was a predictor of reduced personal accomplishment. Finally, the concept of emotional intelligence can also be thought of as a coping strategy. Kohan (2002) and Mendez (2002) have both found negative correlations between emotional intelligence and Burnout.

Burnout: Multicultural Implications and Demographic Correlates

Burnout is a Multicultural Phenomenon

A significant trend in the literature is the recognition of Burnout as a multicultural phenomenon. Research samples have represented (but have not been limited to) such countries as the United States (Elman & Dowd, 1997), Israel (Friedman & Farber, 1992; Pines, 2002), Australia (Sundin-Huard & Fahy, 1999), Turkey (Altun, 2002), South Africa (Levert et al., 2000; Pretorius, 1994), Holland (Kop et al., 1999) and Hong Kong (Yiu-kee & Tang, 1995). Indeed, the present literature review on correlates of Burnout included worldwide samples; approximately one-third of the samples represented the United States and two-thirds represented countries outside the United States. The study of Burnout within many countries provides solid support for the construct. Although it was initially considered “pop psychology” (Maslach et al., 2001) and implausible (Farber, 2000a), the literature’s reflection of Burnout as a worldwide phenomenon has given credibility to the application to diverse cultures.
Specific Demographic Variables: Race and Ethnic Group

Despite the recognition that Burnout is a multicultural phenomenon, the literature seems to have a gap regarding the relationship between Burnout and some cultural variables. Race and ethnic background are often not reported nor even considered in relationship to Burnout (Salyers & Bond, 2001). Indeed, of the correlation studies discussed in the present literature review, only two of them reported specific demographic variables by race. One study described their sample as primarily from African American and European ancestry (Elman & Dowd, 1997), but did not use specific percentages of individuals who comprised these two racial and ethnic groups. Another study did include race and ethnic background of the sample as a specific variable, but found no significant correlations with Burnout (Lackritz, 2004).

There is hope that consideration of race and ethnic demographic variables may become more of a priority in the literature. A very recent study investigating occupational issues across nine cultures showed that Burnout not only exists cross-culturally, but that certain variables have mediating effects on it (Perrewé, in press). Specifically, the authors inquired if self-efficacy mediated the effects of burnout and role stressors in the cultures studied (e.g., the United States, Germany, France, Brazil, Israel, Japan, Hong Kong, China, and Fiji). Burnout was negatively associated with self-efficacy in all nine cultures, and self-efficacy mediated the effects of role conflict and role ambiguity with burnout in eight of the nine cultures (all cultures except France). A point of interest noted by the authors is that work stress
variables should still be investigated within their specific cultures. Even though the study found the presence of Burnout as universal cross-culturally, it is still important to investigate cultural phenomena on micro-levels versus simply assuming understanding of the phenomenon based solely on macro-level data. Studies of this type hold promise for increasing research on the relationship of Burnout and race and ethnic group variables.

A seminal study on the relationship between race and Burnout tentatively suggested that Burnout is more significant in some racial groups than others (Salyers & Bond, 2001). Specifically, African American participants reported significantly less emotional exhaustion and depersonalization than their Caucasian counterparts. There was no significant difference between the groups on reduced personal accomplishment. The age of the participants appeared to be more significant than race in the manifestation of Burnout; younger participants experienced more Burnout than older participants. Finally, racial incongruence with caseload appeared to be a factor in Burnout; case managers who were of a different race than a majority of their caseload reported higher levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. This study demonstrates that the continued emphasis on the role of race and ethnic background in Burnout is absolutely necessary.

There could be many reasons for the lack of inquiry on relationships between Burnout and race and ethnic group variables, such as an oversight on the part of scholars, a reflection of covert racism or white privilege, or merely an aspect of the nature of quantitative research. John Creswell, a leading scholar on research
methodology, stated in his recent research monograph, "Because quantitative studies
try to verify a theory, demographic variables typically enter these models as
intervening or control variables instead of major independent variables" (Creswell,
2003, p. 111). Another reason is that the integration of multicultural issues has
primarily risen within the past 15 years; if this development is the reason for the
paucity of literature then current and future research will begin to include race and
ethnic background as important study variables. Whatever the cause, it is important for
future Burnout research to include racial and ethnic groups as major variables within
studies.

Commonly Reported Demographics

Other demographic characteristics commonly reported in the Burnout literature
to date include gender, age, and time spent working in one's occupation. Researchers
hypothesize that gender plays a significant role in an individual's predisposition to
Burnout (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Emmerik, 2002), specifically; women are more likely
to experience Burnout than men. However, the literature has failed to establish
consistent correlations with this variable. While some researchers have reported no
significant correlations between Burnout and gender (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Gold &
Bachelor, 2001; Hayter, 1999; Thornton, 1992; Visintini & Campanini, 1996), other
researchers have found a relationship. Lert et al. (2001), in their study of physicians
caring for HIV-infected patients in French hospitals; found that male physicians
reported significant, positive relationships between depersonalization of patients and
Burnout. Emmerik’s (2002) study found no significant differences in Burnout between male and female faculty. However, it was discovered that women faculty responded better to coping assistance from the department. Given these varying results, a definitive conclusion cannot yet be drawn regarding the relationship between gender and Burnout.

Similarly, correlations between age and Burnout are inconclusive. While Gold and Bachelor (2001) found that younger public school teachers (< 25 years of age) reported greater personal accomplishment of work tasks than older (> 25 years of age) teachers, other researchers have found no correlations between age and Burnout (Coffey & Coleman, 2001; Hayter, 1999; Visintini & Campanini, 1996; Yiu-kee & Tang, 1995).

Finally, the significant relationship between length of time in one’s profession and Burnout also proves uncertain. Studies of professional mental health workers in the United States and Hong Kong (Thornton, 1992; Yiu-kee & Tang, 1995), French physicians (Lert et al., 2001) and English nurses (Hayter, 1999) established no significance between length of time within their respective professions and Burnout. However, Elman and Dowd’s (1997) study of inpatient substance abuse therapists found a positive relationship between the length of time in the profession with depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment. That is, inpatient substance abuse therapists who had worked in the profession for a significant period of time reported more cynicism related to their patients and less ability to complete work tasks.
Other demographic characteristics such as marital status (Gold & Bachelor, 2001; Visintini & Campanini, 1996), grade level taught for public school teachers (Gold & Bachelor, 2001) and income (Yiu-kee & Tang, 1995) have shown no relationship to Burnout. However, Pines’s (2004) study found that participants who identified as having a higher socioeconomic status reported less Burnout than participants who identified with lower socioeconomic status. A curious finding was a negative relationship between subjects’ smoking habits and reduced personal accomplishment of work tasks (Coffey & Coleman, 2001). Conversely, Elman and Dowd (1997) found that inpatient substance abuse therapists who identified themselves as recovering addicts reported little to no reduced personal accomplishment of work tasks.

Variables Pertinent to Academic Settings:
Demographics and Work Conditions

As discussed previously, there has been little research on the occurrence of Burnout in faculty teaching in institutions of higher learning. However, the research available on this population shows some interesting correlations between variables specific to higher education faculty.

One of the most comprehensive and current studies (Lackritz, 2004) of 265 university faculty found significant relationships between Burnout and variables of gender, age, tenure status, a higher perceived teaching load, time spent grading, obtaining grant money, service, number of student activities, and overall time spent as a faculty member. A surprising finding in the working conditions category was that
the sample reported more burnout when teaching graduate students rather than undergraduate students. The author postulated that this may be a result of faculty needing to take more time to prepare graduate courses (Lackritz, 2004). Furthermore, there were significant, positive correlations with depersonalization and evaluating students, as well as with reduced personal accomplishment and completing student evaluations, office hours, overall productivity, and overall time spent as a faculty member. There were no significant differences with race and ethnic background or academic rank. Perhaps one of the most interesting findings of this study was that Burnout had no significant correlation to the sample’s publication record and professional growth.

Other recent studies show relationships between Burnout and faculty research work, certain organizational climate factors, and support within the department. Singh, Mishra, and Kim (1998) studied the relationship of Burnout to the level of intrinsic motivation to accomplish research. This study of 328 faculty members (260 tenured and 68 untenured) found that faculty members who had lower intrinsic motivation to research had higher burnout and lower job satisfaction. Burnout was higher in faculty members who perceived that they would not be rewarded for doing research have more propensity for Burnout, particularly tenured faculty rather than untenured. A study of 94 faculty members in a South African University (Pretorius, 1994) investigated variables such as gender, age, number of years of teaching, position within the university, and number of students, as well as organizational variables of role conflict, role ambiguity, and participation in decision making. Role conflict, role
ambiguity, participation in decision making, and number of students emerged as the only significant predictors of the Burnout components emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment; the other variables showed no significant relationships to Burnout. Finally, Emmerik's (2002) study found that burned out faculty members (particularly women) respond well to interventions designed to help with coping. More specifically, assistance from a supervisor or colleague resulted in the reduction of emotional exhaustion.

A few studies have produced results that prompt more discussion about the particular dynamics of the manifestation of Burnout in faculty. A recent study of orthopedic surgery faculty members (Sargent, Sotile, Sotile, Rubash, & Barrack, 2001) showed that orthopedic surgery faculty members did not report significant levels of Burnout. Of interest, the faculty members in this sample was compared to orthopedic surgery residents, who did show high levels of emotional exhaustion, and average levels of depersonalization and personal accomplishment. The authors suggested that faculty members did not experience as much Burnout as the residents, because they did not experience quite as many demands in their position. Conversely, Doyle and Hind's (1998) study of university psychology faculty members found that their sample reported high emotional exhaustion and reduced personal accomplishment. Interestingly, depersonalization was low within the sample, which suggests that faculty members may experience high levels of emotional exhaustion and low personal accomplishment due to workload demands but are connected with their students despite these demands.
Conclusion

The literature shows that faculty members in higher education do experience Burnout like other professions. Further, these faculty members have specific variables related to work conditions and demographics. Future inquiry should include consideration of cultural variables such as gender, age, and time spent working in an occupation, but should also investigate other important cultural variables such as race, ethnic background, sexual orientation, and religion. This last variable—religion—may be interesting to explore given that there is almost no literature on the role of religion and Burnout. There has, however, been some mention of the role of religion in one’s sense of significance about self (Pines, 2002). Pines suggested that individuals used to find a sense of existential peace within their religious identity, but in current times that sense of significance has been shifted to one’s occupational identity. Therefore, it would be interesting to investigate if religious affiliation has a mediating effect on the manifestation or intensity of Burnout.

Within a population of university faculty, important variables to examine include the occupational duties of teaching, service, advising, and research, as well as academic rank and tenure status. Additionally, future research should also seek variables that show positive correlations with Burnout prevention. That is, are there personal characteristics or attributes that act as mediating barriers to Burnout? Are there particular characteristics related to faculty members or about the faculty position itself that may assist in developing effective coping strategies (i.e., personality,
intellectual ability, lifestyle, etc.)? Understanding more about the relationships between Burnout and demographic variables will help to increase the career development and occupational satisfaction in this population.

Emotional Intelligence

What is Emotional Intelligence?

During the past decade, the term “Emotional Intelligence” has commonly appeared in both popular literature and academic literature. The interest in Emotional Intelligence (EI) sparked quickly and gained rapid ground (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003), especially in the mid-1990s with the publication of Daniel Goleman’s (1995) best-selling book, Emotional Intelligence.

Scholars were initially critical of EI since it originated within the popular literature rather than the academic literature. This criticism prompted scholars to begin empirical inquiry on EI (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). This intense focus led to the development of research and training programs that have been very influential in business, education, and other occupational sectors.

Interestingly, while EI is recognized among scholars as a relatively new construct (Bar-On, 2005; Caruso, 2004; Emmerling & Goleman, 2003), ideas of the construct originated much earlier. The term first appeared in the literature during the early 1980s (Gardner, 1983). However, some researchers believe that it actually could have been conceptualized much earlier, such as in the 20th century measurement movement (Bar-On, 2005; Caruso, 2004). Another scholar of note is David
McClelland, whose life’s work on achievement and motivation formed much of the basis of thought on the possibility of intelligences other than traditional cognitive intelligence (Winter, 1998). This interest has prompted controversy about the true definitions and applications of EI.

EI is usually conceptualized as a form of intelligence similar to cognitive intelligence (IQ), but distinct from IQ in that EI involves the regulation and use of emotions to bring about success in occupational pursuits and relationships. One of the first definitions by Salovey and Mayer (1990) saw Emotional Intelligence as, “A type of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (p. 189). This definition is often cited in the literature. However, several other definitions of Emotional Intelligence have emerged since that time period, which has resulted in differing models of EI and differing methods of measurement.

Theoretically, EI demonstrates strong predictive validity for success in the workplace—even more so than cognitive intelligence (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003). However, because scholars cannot agree on one definition, model, or a set of characteristics of EI (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003; Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004a), the field needs a common language or standardized definition (Caruso, 2004). In this latter article, Caruso (2004) proposed that this common language would recognize EI as either a human trait or competency that combines emotion with intelligence.
Contemporary Conceptualizations of EI

There are many different models of EI, but the three most recognized models are those of Reuven Bar-On (2000, 2005), Daniel Goleman (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003; Goleman, 1998) and John Mayer, Peter Salovey, and David Caruso (Mayer, Salovey & Caruso, 2004). These models, while sharing some similarities, can still be differentiated from each other.

Peter Salovey and John Mayer (1990) are recognized for first defining the term “Emotional Intelligence” in the literature. In the later 1990s, they, along with David Caruso, developed a more comprehensive model of EI (Mayer et al., 2004). These scholars believe that general intelligence has multiple types (i.e., verbal, spatial, reasoning ability, etc.). Therefore, EI is theoretically a branch of intelligence. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2004) have also used the term “hot intelligences,” which views intelligence as occurring multidimensionally in social, practical, cognitive, and emotional levels.

Mayer and Salovey refer to their model as the “four-branch ability model” (Mayer et al., 2004). These branches include, “…the ability to (a) perceive emotion, (b) use emotion to facilitate thought, (c) understand emotions, and (d) manage emotion” (p. 199). The branches are ordered from the first (theme: perception) to the last (theme: management); theoretically, individuals with higher EI are able to have better integration of the construct at the core of their personalities.

Mayer, Salovey and Caruso (2004) developed an instrument to measure their conceptualization of EI: the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test
(MSCEIT). This instrument is comprised of scales that measure the four conceptualized branches of EI. Tasks of the MSCEIT include identifying emotions in pictures of faces, comparing emotions to tactile and sensory stimuli, identifying changes in emotion and presenting hypothetical situations in which test-takers report how they would respond to the emotional content of the situation. While the authors suggest some flaws with their instrument, they provide evidence that the MSCEIT is an empirically reliable and valid measurement.

The second noteworthy model of EI is that of Daniel Goleman, primarily due to his bestselling book *Emotional Intelligence* (1995). This book has been a catalyst for consulting and training programs in business, human resources, and other corporate sectors. A few years after this book, Goleman (1998) published his theoretical model of EI in another book entitled *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. This model has also been a catalyst for numerous training programs and research. Goleman has also authored many scholarly articles on EI competencies.

Goleman conceptualized EI as “competencies,” in contrast to other conceptualizations such as a form of social intelligence (Bar-On, 2005) or a human potential (Mayer et al., 2004). His model consists of four domains: Self-Awareness, Self-Management, Social Awareness and Relationship Management, each of which become the foundation for competencies. Goleman believes that emotional competency can be learned (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003). Another distinction of Goleman’s theory is that it is specifically applicable to work performance rather than
other areas of human functioning. Goleman’s theory claims to be able to predict how an employee will perform based on the level of emotional competency that the individual possesses (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003).

Goleman’s model (1998) is unique from other models in that it is measured on multidimensional levels. Instead of merely relying on self-report, measurement of emotional competency includes reports from others, simulations, and life data (for example, a narrative about how an individual responded in a particular situation, or how that same individual would respond in a hypothetical situation). Goleman’s current measurement of emotional competency is through the ECI 2.0, or Emotional Competency Inventory. This measure has been based on Goleman’s emotional competency construct and has empirical evidence of reliability, validity, and appropriateness of use.

This third model of interest is that of Reuven Bar-On. Bar-On’s (2005) model, which he describes as “ESI” or the “Emotional-Social Intelligence” model was in large part influenced by Darwin’s concepts of survival and adaptation. Bar-On defines ESI as a “cross-section of interrelated emotional and social competencies, skills and facilitators that determine how effectively we understand and express ourselves, understand others and relate with them, and cope with daily demands” (p. 3). His model contains five key components:

(a) The ability to recognize, understand, and express emotions and feelings, (b) the ability to understand how others feel and relate with them, (c) the ability to manage and control emotions, (d) the ability to manage change, adapt, and solve problems of a personal and interpersonal nature, and (e) the ability to generate positive affect and be self-motivated (p. 3).
In essence, ESI is having good self-awareness of emotions, abilities and weaknesses, and to be able to manage and express these in a way that is productive and positive in interpersonal relationships. Additionally, individuals with high ESI will also have insight into the emotions and abilities of others, relating to others in a way that is “optimistic, positive and self-motivated” (p. 4).

The Bar-On ESI model is measured through an instrument developed in the late 1990 known as the Bar-On EQ-I (Bar-On, 2005). This measure relies on self-report, and consists of 133 items that are scored on a one to five frequency scale. Bar-On’s EQ-i was the first measure of emotional intelligence to be empirically validated, peer reviewed and published by a psychological test publisher. Additionally, Bar-On claims that the EQ-i is the most frequently used measure of emotional intelligence today.

One of the most important things to note about Bar-On’s (2005) model is that he believed ESI is teachable and learnable. In his recent commentary to the EI consortium, Bar-On cited an interesting study that supports his hypothesis. An experimental methodology employing a pre-test post-test of the EQ-i (youth version) on 7th grade students showed that the independent variable “self-science” curriculum increased the students’ abilities in understanding and expressing their emotions and adaptation to the school climate (Stone-McCown et al., as cited in Bar-On, 2005). Bar-On provides other empirical evidence to support that ESI can be taught and learned.
The current state of the EI field reflects much debate over which model of EI is
the most valid (Caruso, 2004). In other words, scholars cannot agree on one definition,
model, constellation of characteristics, or method of measurement. A pressing issue,
then, is the construct validity of EI.

Construct Validity of EI

Establishing construct validity of EI is perhaps the largest struggle of the field
to date, specifically, convergent validity (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Emmerling &
Goleman, 2003; Mayer et al., 2004; Petrides & Furnham, 2000; Petrides, Furnham &
Frederickson, 2004; Warwick & Nettelbeck, 2004). For example, a recent study
investigating the convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity of three widely
used EI measures found that two measures were only moderately related to each other,
whereas the third measure was only very minimally convergent with the latter two
(Bracket & Mayer, 2003). This variation in measurement suggests that the various
models of EI are actually discriminant.

Establishing sound construct validity is a critical issue for measurement and
best practices of a construct. Yet given the many definitions, models, and theorized
components to EI, it is difficult for scholars to arrive at a definitive conclusion about
the construct. To increase confusion, most scholars have provided empirical evidence
that supports their specific model or theory. The core of the debate centers around two
important questions. First, can EI be taught, improved, or learned? Secondly, how is
EI best measured—through self report or through performance assessment?
Both of these questions hold extreme significance for validity of the EI construct. At the core of the first question is the dilemma between EI conceptualized as a skill or ability or conceptualized as an inherent personality trait. This distinction is important. It can be assumed that if EI is a skill or ability with potential for development then it is not like traditional models of cognitive intelligence which, as some researchers have pointed out (Brody, 2004), remains fairly consistent from birth throughout the lifespan. On the other hand, if EI is an inherent personality characteristic, it would be unlikely that it could be developed, changed, or improved within the individual. However, some researchers have demonstrated that EI can be developed through a mediating curriculum or intervention (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003; Stone-McCown et al., as cited in Bar-On, 2005).

The second question concerning measurement also holds implications for the construct validity of EI. The instruments that have been used thus far have employed self-report measures, such as the EQ-I or Emotional Quotient Inventory (Bar-On, 1997), the SEIS or Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale (Schutte et al., 1998) and the TEI-Que or Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (Petrides & Furnham, 2003); and performance measures such as the ECI 2.0 or Emotional Competency Inventory (Emmerling & Goleman, 2003) and the MSCEIT or Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2002). These two types of measurement (i.e., self-report or performance) actually measure two different things. Self-report instruments measure individuals' perceptions of their traits whereas performance instruments measure individuals' actual abilities. Therefore, to establish construct
validity of EI, a distinction must be made between the two. In other words, EI must be
differentiated as either a trait or an ability since traits and abilities are not convergent
(Petrides & Furnham, 2001).

The failure of researchers to establish unified construct validity early in the
field has been problematic. At the very worst, it has led to the haphazard development
of literature and training programs that are not scientifically validated (Caruso, 2004;
Petrides et al., 2004). At the very best, it has inspired legitimate researchers to
continue their quest in fully understanding the construct. The most important
sequential steps are first to develop a sound theory (including a standardized
definition); second, to develop reliable and valid methods of measurement; third, to
use the knowledge about EI to develop appropriate interventions and training
programs (Caruso, 2004; Petrides & Furnham, 2000a).

Trait Emotional Intelligence

The controversy about EI conceptualized as a trait or ability has led to the
development of a new theory, namely that there are two separate forms of EI: Trait EI
and Ability EI (Bracket & Mayer, 2003; Petrides & Furnham, 2000a; Warwick &
Nettelbeck, 2004). Trait EI is affiliated with personality traits and measured through
self-report. Ability EI is affiliated with actual abilities and measured through
performance assessment (Petrides & Furnham, 2000a, 2000b). Trait EI has also been
referred to as "emotional self-efficacy" (Petrides, Frederickson, et al., 2004).
The scholars who have differentiated Trait EI from Ability EI are K. V. Petrides and Adrian Furnham (2001). Their rationale for differentiating between the two constructs was mainly due to the historic problems in measuring EI. The construct was being measured by both self-report and maximum performance assessments, which led to different outcomes with the same individual (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). These difficulties with measurement had implications for the construct validity of EI.

Petrides and Furnham (2001) theorized that Trait EI and Ability EI were “…not mutually exclusive and may therefore co-exist” (p. 427). They cited the current understanding of EI as a constellation of traits or abilities, or, as EI is commonly referred to in the literature, a set of competencies, and implicitly argued that Trait EI is a separate construct that fits into a set of EI competencies. In their seminal work on Trait EI, they stated, “…the present paper does not propose a completely novel approach to EI, but rather tries to systematize and evaluate an approach that largely exists already” (p. 427).

The first priority in researching this theory was to establish discriminant validity between Trait EI and other forms of EI. Specifically, Petrides and Furnham (2001) hypothesized that Trait EI would be related to personality. They performed a factor analysis using the Bar-On EQ-i and the Eysenck Personality Profiler and found that Trait EI emerged with the three Eysenckian factors (Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism), which made it a distinguishable factor. However, the analysis also revealed that Trait EI is not a separate personality construct but rather a
"distinguishable, lower-order, composite, personality construct" (p. 442). This study clearly showed the discriminant validity between Trait EI and other EI models.

This study also investigated the factorial structure of Bar-On's EQ-i. Petrides and Furnham (2001) extracted items on the EQ-i that they believed represented traits. Their results indicated that the instrument "...be amended to cover more extensively the sampling domains of trait EI" (p. 437). Later they proposed that instrument scales should consist of 15 sub-characteristics: Adaptability, Assertiveness, Emotion Appraisal (self and others), Emotion Expression, Emotion Management (others), Emotion Regulation, Impulsiveness (low), Relationship Skills, Self-Esteem, Self-Motivation, Social Competence, Stress Management, Trait Empathy, Trait Happiness, and Trait Optimism.

Petrides and Furnham (2001) performed other construct validity testing on Trait EI, obtaining results that supported the Trait EI construct. In a second factor analysis study using a modified version of the EQ-i and the NEO P-R assessment of the Big Five personality dimensions, they found again that Trait EI emerged as a "...distinguishable, lower-order construct..." (p. 441). While this study showed a weaker relationship between Trait EI and the Big Five personality dimensions, the results showed enough significance to establish discriminant validity of Trait EI from other EI models.

The identification of Trait EI as a distinct personality trait versus a cognitive processing ability was also substantiated by Saklofske et al. (2003) in their research on EI, personality, and alexithymia. Discriminant validity between Trait EI and Ability EI
was also well supported in a recent study that sought to identify psychological variables underlying EI (Warwick & Nettlebeck, 2004). Petrides and Furnham (2003) also provided support for incremental validity on personality traits in two separate experimental studies comparing the response patterns of individuals with high and low Trait EI.

With the establishment of the construct validity of Trait EI, Petrides and Furnham (2001) began the development of an instrument that would accurately measure the construct. Thus, the TEIQue was developed (Petrides & Furnham, 2001; Petrides & Furnham, 2003). This instrument is a 144-item questionnaire of the 15 subscales, using a 7-point Likert scale and reporting a .86 internal consistency rating. The TEIQue was later shortened to the TEIQue-SF (short form), which is a 30 item questionnaire that yields a global Trait EI score.

The research on Trait EI has continued to yield sound construct validity and promising insight into the function of human personality. For example, Petrides, Frederickson, and Furnham (2004) found that high school students with high Trait EI were more likely to be successful in their courses, even when their intellectual capacities (i.e., IQ) would not predict such success. This study also found that students who possessed high Trait EI were less likely to be absent or excluded from school. Spence, Oades, and Caputi (2004) measured 95 undergraduate psychology students and found that Trait EI was correlated with the presence of more autonomous, personal goal setting behaviors. The researchers also concluded that Trait EI is related to emotional well-being (Spence et al., 2004). Austin's (2004) study of college
students and adult volunteers found that Trait EI was related to an individual’s ability to recognize quickly and accurately the emotions of others. Furnham and Petrides (2004) found in their study of college freshmen that Trait EI is one of the strongest predictors of happiness. And, while the results of Zee and Wabeke’s (2004) study of 1186 managers did not yield as much support for Trait EI as a differentiated personality characteristic, they did find that Trait EI was present in managers who worked primarily in what John Holland (1985), a famous career development theorist, labeled “enterprising” environments.

Recent research on Trait EI may shed light on how humans cope in stressful situations. Furnham et al. (2002) studied individuals with the “repressor” coping style—that is, people who cope by demonstrating high defensiveness and low anxiety, versus coping by other means (i.e., defensive/high anxious, non-defensive/low anxious, non-defensive/high anxious). The research found that repressors “consistently emerged in self-report measures as the most healthy, happy and adapted group” (p. 120). This study was replicated and found similar results (Furnham et al., 2003). Despite the use of a different Trait EI measure, this study (Furnham et al., 2003) showed that repressors have higher overall scores on Trait EI, as well as higher optimism. These studies are significant in the consideration of human coping; they may implicate that personality characteristics (i.e. Trait EI) may have a considerable impact on whether an individual responds resiliently or maladaptively in the onset of stress.
Trait EI: Thought from Other Scholars

Trait EI construct is one of the newest conceptualizations of EI at the present time. Therefore, the research does not reflect a lot of outside commentary specifically on Trait EI—either dissenting or supporting. Many of the prominent scholars in the EI field believe that EI is a developable ability (Bar-On, 2005; Caruso, 2004; Emmerling & Goleman, 2003) more so than a trait. According to David Caruso (2004), non-ability definitions of EI should not be considered EI.

While some prominent scholars posit that there cannot be a distinction between Trait EI and Ability EI (Goleman, 2005), others are beginning to admit that there could be merit to the Trait EI theory. Later in his commentary to the Emotional Intelligence Consortium, David Caruso (2004) admitted that the work and opinions of other researchers is needed in the field, and specifically cited the work of “Adrian Furnham” (p. 6). Adding to the controversy, scholars other than Petrides and Furnham are finding support for the theoretical differentiation of Trait EI and Ability EI (Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Saklofske et al., 2003; Warwick & Nettlebeck, 2004).

While the Trait EI construct yields hopeful pathways into understanding the human psyche, there are still limitations. The construct is relatively young, the current measures need to be refined and tested (Zee & Wabeke, 2004), and the understanding of the construct needs to be solidified (Furnham & Petrides, 2004; Petrides & Furnham, 2003). Future research is needed to address these limitations.
Findings from the Literature Review and Research Questions for the Present Study

*Burnout: Considerations for Current Research*

The present literature review has demonstrated that the past 30 years of research on Burnout holds promising steps toward fully understanding the construct. With good discriminant and convergent validity from other psychological constructs, Burnout has been established as an important occupational phenomenon worthy of empirical inquiry.

However, a major theme of the literature is that scholars cannot agree on the etiology of Burnout. Specifically, research on the role of internal variables, such as personality traits, coping strategies, and values has not been as important a priority as research on external variables. Indeed, the present literature review reflects this research trend. Approximately 65% of the studies for this literature review examined the relationships of external variables with Burnout, showing inconclusive relationships. In contrast, approximately 35% of the studies for this literature review researched the relationships of internal variables with Burnout, with strong support for all of the internal variables (i.e., personality characteristics, existential issues, values, perceptions and coping styles). Therefore, an important priority is to continue to investigate the etiology of Burnout through correlative research, specifically examining relationships of Burnout to internal variables.

An often neglected population in the study of Burnout is faculty who teach in higher education. The small amounts of published research show that this population is just as susceptible to Burnout as other populations (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Lackritz,
2004; Talbot, 2000). Even more unsettling is the dearth of literature about Burnout in the counselor education field. As wellness is an important part of a counselor’s professional identity and practice (Myers, 1991; Wrenn, 1962), a study that investigates the relationship of Burnout within this profession would be foundational and provide more insight into the occupational dynamics of counselor educators. Furthermore, a study of this sort could provide more insight into the implementation of Burnout prevention into graduate counseling courses.

Finally, this literature review has revealed that multicultural identity is an often neglected variable in Burnout studies—specifically, the variables of race, ethnic background, sexual orientation, and religion. These variables are extremely important to consider in relationship to occupational Burnout, since individuals who do not identify with a dominant culture may be faced with issues of oppression, racism, and stereotyping in the work setting. Therefore, the Burnout field as a whole should begin purposefully including these variables in future research studies. While it is true that Burnout has been studied in many different cultures worldwide, it is important that researchers begin studying it within a specific culture (Perrewé et al., in press). Specifically, researchers should study Burnout dynamics (i.e., occurrence, manifestation, coping strategies, etc.) within an identified culture.

**Rationale for Choosing Trait EI as the Internal Variable**

The present literature review on EI reveals an interesting dilemma to researchers wishing to study this construct. In essence, to study EI, a researcher must
choose from a multitude of theoretical models and measures of EI before commencing with a study. The varying EI models can be problematic since most of them do provide support through empirical evidence.

In advance of choosing a particular model of EI, it is important to discuss why the EI construct itself was chosen for the present study. In its most general definition—a human trait or competency that combines emotion with intelligence (Caruso, 2004)—EI is an aspect of human psychological functioning. Therefore, it would be appropriate to choose EI as a major construct in a study that wishes to investigate the relationship between variables that relate to human functioning. This literature review has established the need for continued study on the relationship between Burnout and internal variables, and therefore, EI was chosen to represent the internal variable.

Another important point to note is that the emotional exhaustion component of Burnout is often the most often identified component that shares relationships with specific variables (Maslach et al., 2001). This is substantiated in this study’s literature review, since emotional exhaustion seemed to have the most statistical significance with other variables. Since the concepts of “emotional exhaustion” and “Emotional Intelligence” are rooted in the affective element of human beings, it would be interesting to see if there is indeed an inverse relationship when comparing emotional intelligence with Burnout.

Trait EI, as conceptualized by K. V. Petrides and Adrian Furnham, was chosen as the theoretical model of EI, since it was most congruent with the purpose and
constructs of this study. First, Trait EI is defined by Petrides and Furnham (2000) to be a personality trait, which is consistent with this researcher’s definition of “internal variable.” Second, Trait EI is presently measured through a self-report instrument. Burnout is also measured through self-report instruments. Therefore, for consistency in measurement and in the participants’ experience of completing the survey, it was important to measure the internal variable through a self-report instrument rather than an ability-based instrument. Finally, Petrides and Furnham, in their initial work on Trait EI, believed that Trait EI would share relationships with human traits such as coping styles (Furnham et al., 2002; Petrides and Furnham, 2001).
CHAPTER III: METHODS

Restatement of the Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine if counselor educators experience Burnout. This study also sought to determine to what degree counselor educators experience Burnout, and what variables were associated with it. An implicit goal of this study was to address the current controversy in the Burnout field on the etiology of Burnout by investigating if internal variables or external variables would have greater statistical significance. This study used Trait Emotional Intelligence (Trait EI) as the internal variable, and work and demographic characteristics were explored as the external variables.

Quantitative methods were the most appropriate to address the purpose of the study; the specific design of this study was survey research. Quantitative research is consistent with a post-positivist epistemology (Creswell, 2003), which believes that problems must be studied through reductionist methods. According to the post-positivist epistemology, absolute truth is a worthy goal, but is probably unreachable. The research questions were as follows:

1. To what degree do counselor educators experience Burnout?
2. Does Trait EI share a significant, negative relationship with Burnout?
3. Do demographic characteristics (external variables) share more significant, positive relationships with Burnout than Trait EI (internal variable)?
Sampling Procedures

Participants in this study were counselor educators (N=289) teaching in United States counselor education programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). The rationale for selecting counselor educators teaching in CACREP-accredited programs centered on CACREP accreditation mandating the very highest curriculum and professional development standards for counselor education programs. Therefore, due to these rigorous standards, it was surmised that counselor educators teaching in CACREP-accredited programs were likely to have the highest propensity for Burnout.

Contact information for the population was obtained from the most recent CACREP directory, published online at www.cacrep.org. From this information, a database was developed that housed the Internet Web sites for each CACREP program (N=189). Participants were selected by obtaining contact information (i.e., e-mail address) for two to five counselor educators from each program's Web site; selection was done in a random manner from all faculty who were identified on the program Web site as teaching “counseling” courses. However, not all Web sites were accessible, which resulted in inclusion of approximately 85 counselor education programs across the United States. This sampling procedure yielded a database of 400 participants.

Sample size was determined to be at 250 for good generalizability. The formula used to tabulate this sample size was $N = 2 \left( \frac{\delta}{y} \right)^2$ for contrasting formulas and $N = 2 \left( \frac{\delta}{y} \right)^2 + 1$ for correlating formulas (Courtney, 2002). Based on the type of
instrument and desired data analysis procedures, these formulas designated an appropriate sample of 75 to 250 participants. The sample size of 250 was chosen to accommodate the higher spectrum of generalizability requirements.

During the initial stages of the study, it was suggested by a member of the researcher’s doctoral committee that the sample size be increased in order to accommodate for the limitations of a Web survey administration. Therefore, the survey was sent to 400 participants. One hundred and one participants were eliminated due to e-mail bounces. Ten more were eliminated, because they e-mailed stating that they were not counselor educators and requested to be removed from the sample so as not to skew the results or return rate. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 289 participants.

Additionally, a pilot sample consisting of approximately 10 doctoral students from Oregon State University helped provide feedback about the data collection procedures. Specifically, this pilot sample provided helpful information in the administration of the Web survey used in this study.

Instruments

*Burnout Measure*

Burnout was measured by the Burnout Measure Short Version (BMS), which was developed by Dr. Ayala Malach-Pines (2005). The BMS is an adaptation of the longer Burnout Measure published by Pines and Aronson (1988) and was developed to improve ease in administration and scoring (Pines, 2005). The BMS contains 10 items
rated on a seven-point frequency scale, and yields an overall score categorizing Burnout into “danger signs,” “Burnout,” “very serious Burnout,” and Burnout that “requires immediate professional help.” The longer form of the BMS measures Burnout within three scales: physical exhaustion, emotional exhaustion, and mental exhaustion. Permission to use the BMS in this present study, including a copy of the instrument, was provided by Ayala Malach Pines via e-mail on December 2, 2004.

The BMS indicates reliability and validity within appropriate norms for research. Pines’s (2005) study indicated internal consistency ranges from .85 to .92, with a test-retest coefficient at .74 for a three-month interval. Face validity was established through various professional workshops relating to Burnout that were presented throughout the United States and Israel. Construct validity was established through correlational analyses with relevant variables, with p-values < .0001.

The rationale for selecting the BMS was threefold. First, the BMS appears to be the most appropriate Burnout measure for this population, despite it being recognized as the “second most used” Burnout instrument (Pines, 2005; Schaufeli et al., 2001; Shirom & Ezrachi, 2003). The most widely used Burnout instrument, the MBI, was initially considered for this study. However, the version that was developed for educators (MBI-ES) was normed on teachers of K-12 populations and was therefore not appropriate for administration on a sample of academic (higher education) faculty. Second, the BMS, in its shortened version, was able to be administered more easily and was predictive of a higher survey return rate. Third, the BMS and BM both show strong reliability and validity (Pines, 2005; Shirom &
Ezrachi, 2003). Additionally, the BM and MBI show good cross-validation, particularly in the area of emotional exhaustion (Schaufeli et al., 2001).

**TEIQue-SF**

Trait EI was measured by the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire-Short Form (TEIQue-SF) developed by K. V. Petrides and Adrian Furnham (2001, 2003). The TEIQue-SF consists of 30 questions rated by a seven-point frequency scale, yielding a global Trait EI score. The TEIQue-SF is the shortened version of the longer TEIQue, which consists of 144 questions designed to provide comprehensive understanding of Trait EI (Petrides & Furnham, 2001). The long form measures 15 subscales: Adaptability, Assertiveness, Emotion Perception-self and others, Emotion Expression, Emotion Management-others, Emotion Regulation, Impulsiveness-low, Relationship Skills, Self-Esteem, Self-Motivation, Social Confidence, Stress Management, Trait Empathy, Trait Happiness, and Trait Optimism. The TEIQue-SF global score is based on these subscales. Internal consistency coefficients for the TEIQue are reported at .86 (Petrides & Furnham, 2003). K. V. Petrides granted permission to use this instrument via personal e-mail on December 3, 2004.

The TEIQue was selected to measure Trait EI as it is currently the most congruent measure with the Trait EI construct as defined by Petrides and Furnham (2001). The short form was selected for greater ease in administration, which is predictive of a higher survey return rate.
Demographic Questionnaire

A short demographic questionnaire was developed to measure demographic variables (i.e., external variables). Demographic variables included academic rank, tenure status, length of time working as a counselor educator, percentage of work load spent on the tasks of teaching, student advising, service and research, gender, sexual orientation, age, religion, and race and ethnic background. These specific variables were chosen in congruency with this study’s literature review.

The Compiled Survey for the Present Study

The final survey for the present study consisted of 53 questions. Forty questions were rated on a seven-point frequency scale, and the remaining 13 questions were answered by checking the response that best corresponded with the participant. Initial pilot tests of the survey indicated that the completion time was approximately 10-12 minutes. See Appendix 1 for a copy of the survey.

Survey Design

The survey design was initially based on the 11 recommendations proposed by Dillman (2000) but was slightly modified to accommodate the university’s Institutional Review Board requirements and feedback from the pilot sample. (It should be noted that no content or instruments were modified, only the survey presentation.) The first screen of the survey was the Informed Consent page. At the end of this page, participants either agreed to proceed with the survey or declined. If
participants agreed to complete the survey, they were required to enter their e-mail address. The e-mail address was used to determine who had completed the survey and who had not, which assisted in managing the contact correspondence during the data collection period. Participants were assured of confidentiality, and their first or last name was not requested at any point during the survey.

The content of the second, third, and fourth survey screens was the BMS, TEIQue-SF, and demographic questionnaire, respectively. To make the survey similar to a pencil-and-paper instrument, answers were saved from page to page. At the end of the fourth page, participants submitted their answers through a button that read “Submit Answers.” The last and final page of the survey was a thank-you message.

The graphic design of the survey was simple: a sans serif font with a muted background color. The university logo was present on the Informed Consent page in order to confirm the legitimacy of the study to the participants. Specific instructions were provided at multiple points. Questions were answered by clicking on the number of the answer that best reflected the participant. Each question could only register one answer, which the exception of question 53. This question inquired about race and ethnic background, and participants were allowed to choose as many answers that applied. Question 53 had the only write-in box; if participants identified as “International,” they were asked to type in their country of origin. The format of question 53 was designed to honor the multiple variations within race and ethnic background, which is important within the counseling profession (Sue & Arredondo, 1992).
Data Collection Procedures

The survey was administered via the World Wide Web. The rationale for this type of administration was to recognize the changing nature of survey research due to advances in technology, as well as to provide quicker and easier access to participants. According to Don Dillman (2000), an expert in research survey administration, "There is no other method of collecting survey data that offers so much potential for so little cost as Web surveys" (p. 400).

Web survey administration is quickly becoming standard within the fields of educational and scientific research; however, this method is not without challenges. In his most recent book on survey administration, *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*, Dillman (2000) argued that Web surveys do have limitations. Particularly, they are limited in their visual stimulation and interaction capabilities, that participants may not have access to the technology required to complete the survey (i.e., computer and Internet), and the participants may not know how to use the technology required to complete the survey. However, these limitations were likely not an issue for the present sample. As employees of institutions of higher education, counselor educators are very likely to have a personal computer and e-mail address, as well as to have the skills to use basic features of this technology. (This study required that participants have access to a personal computer, be able to navigate the Internet, and be able to use e-mail.) To address the limitation of visual simulation and interaction capabilities, the survey was designed according to Dillman’s (2000) recommendations for Web surveys.
Survey Administration

Administration of the survey was consistent with Dillman's (2000) survey implementation system, but modified for this study to accommodate a Web administration. Dillman’s survey implementation consists of approximately five contacts:

1. The First Contact: A prenotice E-mail
2. Second Contact: The cover letter (e-mail) and Web survey
3. Third through Fifth Contacts: The thank you and reminders.

The first contact introduced the study and informed participants that the survey would be sent a few days later. The second through fifth contacts included a link to the survey, which was administered via the Internet. A copy of the Informed Consent document was automatically e-mailed to the participant and the researcher when participants clicked “I Agree” in order to begin the survey. Participants filled out the survey and then submitted their answers. They were then removed from the e-mail request list. The data collection time period was five weeks. See Appendix B for a copy of the sample correspondence.

There was a small incentive for participants to complete the survey. Two $50 gift certificates to Amazon.com were offered. Two participants were randomly selected; drawing of the gift certificates took place on April 23, 2005.
Accounting for Threats to Validity

Internal Threats

Care was taken to protect participants from internal threats to validity. One issue that was considered in the overall research design was that a Web survey requires participants to have familiarity with and comfort navigating the Internet. Therefore, only participants who had an identified e-mail address were selected. It was assumed that if participants had an e-mail address, they would likely have the technological skills required to complete the survey.

Survey limitations. Other potential threats to internal validity regarded two additional limitations to the survey. First, a Web survey could contain technological problems that would not occur with a traditional paper-and-pencil survey. Therefore, to reduce this threat to validity, a computer programmer was available at all times to troubleshoot any technical problems that arise. Furthermore, it was determined that if a participant could not fully complete a survey due to technological problems, the data from that survey would not be included in the analysis.

Second, it was considered that seven-point frequency scales might be subject to a response bias, in that participants could choose a consistent middle answer (i.e., “4” on a 1-7 Likert scale). Therefore, after the data was collected, the survey item answers were analyzed for response bias. Please see Chapter 4 for more details.
External Threats

To reduce external threats to validity, assistance was employed from two professionals in the statistical analysis: Dr. Tim Bergquist from Northwest Christian College (Eugene, Oregon) and Dr. Wayne Courtney from Oregon State University (Corvallis, Oregon). Both of these individuals teach statistics courses at their respective institutions. Drs. Bergquist and Courtney assisted with drawing correct inferences from the data.

Construct Validity Threats

To reduce the threat of inadequate construct validity, the researcher chose instruments designed to measure the identified variables of the study. Specifically, to measure Burnout, the Burnout Measure Short Form was used (Pines, 2005). This instrument has been shown to have reliability and validity appropriate to psychological testing standards. Discriminant and convergent validity have also been established for the Burnout construct (Meier, 1984; Iacovides, 2003; Shirom & Ezrachi, 2003).

The Trait Emotional Intelligence Short Form was used to measure Trait EI. This instrument has also been shown to have reliability and validity appropriate for the construct and psychological testing standards (Petrides & Furnham, 2001, 2003). Petrides and Furnham have also established discriminant, convergent and incremental validity for the Trait EI construct (2001, 2003).
The demographic questionnaire was created for this study, which is standard practice in social science research. The items were comprised of closed-ended questions on characteristics based on the literature review.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Characteristics of the Sample

Return Rate

Participants in this study were counselor educators (N=289) teaching in United States counselor education programs accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Data collection was initiated through a Web survey with reminders sent via e-mail. 132 surveys were completed, resulting in an initial return rate of 46%. However, 21 surveys were deleted from the analysis because of incomplete responses. Therefore, the usable return was 38.4%, representing 111 surveys.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

As per the literature review for this study, a questionnaire was developed to measure demographic and work condition variables. These variables included academic rank; tenure status; length of time working as a counselor educator; percentage of work load spent on the tasks of teaching, student advising, service, and research; gender; sexual orientation; age; religion; and race and ethnic background. Respondent percentages were calculated for each of these variables.
Academic rank. 2.7% of the sample were adjunct professor/part time instructors; 2.7% were full time instructors; 32.43% were assistant professors; 25.23% were associate professors; 35.14% were full professors; and 1.8% were professor emeriti.

Tenure status. 17.12% of the sample were non-tenured; 27.03% were working towards tenure; and 55.86% were tenured.

Length of time working as a counselor educator. 9.91% of the sample have worked in their profession between 1-2 years; 18.92% have worked in their profession between 3-5 years; 26.13% have worked in their profession between 6-12 years; and 45.05% have worked in their profession 13 years or longer.

Percentage of work load spent teaching. 29.73% of the sample identified as spending 25% or less time teaching; 47.75% identified as spending 50% or less time teaching; 21.62% identified as spending 75% or less time teaching; and less than 1% identified as spending 100% of time teaching.

Percentage of work load spent student advising. 91.89% of the sample identified as spending 25% or less time student advising; 6.31% identified as spending 50% or less time student advising; less than 1% identified as spending 75% or less time student advising; and less than 1% identified spending 100% of time student advising.

Percentage of time spent on service. 74.77% of the sample identified as spending 25% or less time in service; 19.82% identified as spending 50% or less time
in service; 5.41% identified as spending 75% or less of time in service; and no respondents identified spending 100% of time in service.

Percentage of time spent on research. 73.87% of the sample identified as spending 25% or less time on research; 20.72% identified as spending 50% or less time on research; 5.41% identified as spending 75% or less time on research; and no respondents identified spending 100% of time on research.

Gender. 47.75% of the sample were women; 51.35% were men. There were no respondents who identified as transgendered.

Sexual orientation. 1.8% of the sample were bisexual; 2.7% were gay; 94.59% were heterosexual; and less than 1% were lesbian.

Age. 1.8% of the sample identified their age between 20-30; 22.52% identified their age between 31-40; 23.42% identified their age between 41-50; 40.54% identified their age between 51-60; 9.01% identified their age between 61-70; and 2.7% identified their age as 70 or older. The average age was 49.55.

Religion. 15.32% of the sample were Agnostic; 5.41% were Atheist; less than 1% were Buddhist; 59.46% were Christian; no respondents were Hindu; 3.6% were Jewish; no respondents were Muslim; less than 1% were Pagan; 2.7% were Naturalist; and 11.71% identified as other religion.

Race and ethnic background. 4.5% of the sample were African-American; 1.8% were Asian American; 22.52% were European American; 2.7% were Latino/a/Hispanic; 2.7% were Native American or Indigenous; 64.86% were
White/Caucasian; and less than 1% identified as other race or ethnic background. No respondents identified as African, Middle Eastern, Black, East Indian, Pacific Islander/Alaskan, Biracial, Multiracial, or International. The percentages on this variable are greater than 100% since respondents could choose as many answers that applied.

Response Bias

Response bias is defined as “a measurement artifact which emerges from the context of a particular situation that affects one or more people” (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994, p. 376). In survey research, response bias could occur through poorly designed measures. For example, question structure or scaling could lead participants to answer in a prescribed manner, which then affects the soundness of the data.

The measures used in this study consisted of a seven-point frequency scale. Therefore, there was a potential for response bias in that participants could choose a middle answer (i.e., 4). Given this concern, it was important to analyze the data for response bias. Modes were calculated for each of the BMS and TEIQue-SF scores. Only two items on the BMS resulted in a mode of 4 (i.e., “Tired” and “Disappointed with People”). No other items on both the BMS and the TEIQue-SF resulted in a mode of 4. This indicates that response bias was not likely a significant issue in this study.
Research Question 1

*Research Question 1: To What Degree Do Counselor Educators Experience Burnout?*

The Burnout Measure Short Form (BMS) was used to measure Burnout. This measure uses a seven-point frequency scale to evaluate 10 items. The answers are then averaged and a global Burnout score is given. A score of 2.4 or less indicates "a very low level of Burnout," a score between 2.5 and 3.4 indicates "danger signs of Burnout," a score of 3.5 to 4.4 indicates "Burnout," a score of 4.5 and above indicates "a very serious problem of Burnout," and a score of 5.5 or above "requires immediate professional help" (Pines, 2005).

Since Burnout on the BMS is determined at 2.5, the first hypothesis was that scores on the BMS would be at or above 2.5 (H₁: BMS scores ≥ 2.5). The alternate hypothesis was that the scores on the BMS would be less than 2.5 (H₀: BMS scores < 2.5). Descriptive statistics were used to investigate the first hypothesis. The sample mean for the BMS was 2.35 (SD = .82). Confidence intervals were set at .95 (α = .05); the lower limit was 2.198 and the upper limit was 2.503. The margin of error was .153. See Figure 1 for a histogram of the Burnout scores.
Since $H_1$ was rejected, it became a matter of interest to analyze the Burnout scores by percentages. 58.56% of the sample ($N = 65$) scored less than 2.49 on the BMS. 30.63% of the sample ($N = 34$) scored between 2.50 to 3.49 on the BMS. 9.01% of the sample ($N = 10$) scored between 3.50 to 4.49 on the BMS. 1.80% of the sample ($N = 2$) scored between 4.50 to 5.49 on the BMS. No respondents scored higher than 5.5 on the BMS. While the mean BMS score indicated that counselor educators experience low levels of Burnout, the percentages of counselor educators ($N = 46$) scoring higher than 2.4 on the BSM established that some counselor educators experience Burnout. See Figure 2 for a frequency distribution of the BMS scores.
To analyze the significance of the Burnout score, a hypothesis test on the population mean using the standard normal distribution was employed. The hypothesized value of mean Burnout score of ≥ 2.5 was set as a condition of the test. The test statistic was -1.9210 (p-value = .0274; \( p < .05 \)). Therefore, \( H_1 \) was rejected since the sample mean BMS score was ≤ 2.5.

Figure 2
Frequency Distribution of Burnout Scores
**Burnout scores by item.** Since Burnout was lower than expected, it became a matter of interest to investigate the scores by item on the BMS. There were a total of 10 items: tired, disappointed with people, hopeless, trapped, helpless, depressed, physically weak/sickly, worthless/like a failure, difficulties sleeping, and "I’ve had it."

The two highest items by mean and the two lowest items by mean were of most interest. The highest item was "tired" ($M = 4.10; SD = 1.29; \text{range 1-7}$). The second highest item was "disappointed with people" ($M = 3.44; SD = 1.10$). The lowest item was "worthless" ($M = 1.53; SD = .81$). The second to lowest item was "helpless" ($M = 1.86; SD = .98$). The maximum score was 7, and the minimum score was 0. See Table 1 for BMS scores by item.
Table 1
*Burnout Scores by Item*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Min</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tired</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed with people</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeless</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapped</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically weak/sickly</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthless/Like a failure</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties sleeping</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I've had it&quot;</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the two highest items of "Tired" and "Disappointed with People" also had mode scores of 4 on a seven-point frequency scale. This could potentially indicate response bias. However, no other scores in both the BMS and TEIQue-SF resulted in a mode of 4, which could suggest that the scores on the first two items were indeed authentic representations of the sample.
Research Question 2

Research Question 2: Does Trait EI share a significant, negative relationship with Burnout?

The TEIQue-SF was used to measure Trait EI. This measure uses a seven-point frequency scale to measure 30 items. Fifteen of the items are reverse scored. The items are then summed, and a global Trait EI score is given. The lowest possible score is 30, and the highest possible score is 220, with a median score of 120. Therefore, based on this range it can be assumed that higher Trait EI would yield a score between 120 and 220.

Descriptive statistics were first used to obtain the mean scores from the sample ($M = 174.15; SD = 14.01$). Confidence intervals were set at .95 ($\alpha = .05$); the lower limit was 171.55 and the upper limit was 176.76. The margin of error was 2.61. The highest score was 203, and the lowest score was 132. The distribution of scores moderately resembled a normal curve. See Figure 3 for a histogram of the TEIQue-SF scores.
A Pearson product moment correlation was used to measure the direction and strength of the relationship between Trait EI and Burnout ($y = -0.0235x + 6.4433; R^2 = 0.1612$). This analysis yielded a moderate, negative correlation between the Trait EI scores and Burnout scores ($r = -0.4015$). See Figure 4 for a scatter diagram of the correlation.
Given the moderate, negative correlation between the Burnout scores and Trait EI scores, the question arose if it was possible to predict Burnout given Trait EI. A hypothesis test (linear regression) was performed on the slope of the correlation. The null hypothesis was that the slope of the correlation equaled zero ($H_0$: Slope $\leq 0$; $H_a$: Slope $> 0$). The regression equation yielded an $F$ of 20.94 ($p = 0.0000126; p < .001$). This equation did indicate a significant relationship between Burnout and Trait EI, although Trait EI only explains 16% of the variance in Burnout. While the linear regression was significant, it was not a good fit because of the low $r$-square value. However, the second null hypothesis was still rejected since Trait EI shares a moderate, negative correlation with Burnout. See Table 2 for the results of the regression analysis.
Table 2

_Hypothesis Test on the Slope of the Correlation_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.9261</td>
<td>11.9261</td>
<td>20.9428</td>
<td>**.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>62.0714</td>
<td>0.56946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.9975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001

Research Question 3

*Question 3: Do Demographic Characteristics (External Variables) Share More Significant, Positive Relationships with Burnout than Trait EI (Internal Variable)?*

To answer the third research question, separate Chi-square tests of independence were performed against Burnout and each demographic variable. The variables analyzed included academic rank; tenure status; length of time working as a counselor educator; percentage of work load spent on the tasks of teaching, student advising, service, and research; gender; sexual orientation; age; religion; and race and ethnic background. The value of 2.5 or greater (i.e., BMS score) was set as a condition of Burnout. Two of the variables were unable to be analyzed through the Chi-square test due to small cell sizes (i.e., percentage of time spent advising and sexual orientation). Only two of the variables yielded a significant relationship to Burnout:
academic rank ($\chi^2 = 12.66; p = .0018; p < .01$) and age ($\chi^2 = 15.35; p = .0005; p < .001$). Tenure status, length of time working as a counselor educator, percentage of work load teaching, percentage of workload researching, percentage of workload performing service, gender, religion, and race and ethnic background were all independent of Burnout. See Table 3 for the results of the Chi-square analyses.

### Table 3
*Burnout and External Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic rank</td>
<td>12.6641</td>
<td>**.0018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure status</td>
<td>5.2009</td>
<td>0.0742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time working as a CE</td>
<td>1.3571</td>
<td>0.2440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>0.4016</td>
<td>0.8181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student advising</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0.3838</td>
<td>0.5356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0.7833</td>
<td>0.3761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.5047</td>
<td>0.4775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>15.3501</td>
<td>***.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0.4186</td>
<td>0.5176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnic background</td>
<td>2.8219</td>
<td>0.0930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$p < .01$**

***$p < .001$***
Since the variables of percentage of time spent advising and sexual orientation were not able to be analyzed through the Chi-square test of independence, these variables were queried for analysis through descriptive statistics. On percentage of time spent advising, most of the respondents identified as advising 25% of the time or less. Eight respondents reported advising more than 25%. The mean Burnout scores for these eight respondents was 2.4 ($M = 2.4; SD = .45$). Therefore, it can be assumed that advising load does not share a relationship to Burnout.

On sexual orientation, two respondents were bisexual, three respondents were gay, and one respondent was lesbian. The mean Burnout scores for these six respondents was 2.72 ($M = 2.72; SD = .28; M > 2.4$). However, due to this small amount of data, these results cannot be generalized to the larger population.

**Burnout, academic rank, and age.** Since academic rank and age were not independent of Burnout, a further query between these two variables was performed. In the age category of 61 years or older (N = 15), 100% scored less than 2.5 on the BMS. In the age category of 51-60 (N = 45), 67% scored less than 2.5 on the BMS. In the age category of 51-60 and academic rank of full professor (N = 27) 85% reported Burnout scores less than 2.5. Conversely, in the age category of 31-40 (N = 25), 72% scored 2.5 or greater on the BMS. In the age category of 31-40 and academic rank of assistant professor (N = 17), 76% scored 2.5 or greater on the BMS. These percentages indicate there is a relationship between age, academic rank, and Burnout within this population.
To investigate further the relationship between Burnout, age, and rank, an
ANOVA was performed on these variables. Age was found to be significant (p-value
= 0.0115; p < .05), but not rank (p-value = 0.8294; p > .05). See Table 4.

Table 4
Burnout, Age, and Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0678</td>
<td>3.5339</td>
<td>5.7025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>66.9296</td>
<td>0.6197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.9975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.1902</td>
<td>0.3033</td>
<td>10.5176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>-0.0193</td>
<td>0.08917</td>
<td>-0.2160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.2244</td>
<td>0.08728</td>
<td>-2.5709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
*p < .05

Since age was found to be significant, but rank was not, separate regressions were implemented for Burnout and age, and Burnout and rank, respectively. Burnout and age were significant (p-value = 0.0009; p < .001), as were Burnout and rank (p-
value = 0.0349; p < .05). See Tables 5 and 6 for results of the separate regression analyses.
### Table 5
**Burnout and Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.0389</td>
<td>7.0389</td>
<td>11.4585</td>
<td>***0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>66.9585</td>
<td>0.6143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.9975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.1530</td>
<td>12.6900</td>
<td>3.31E-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.2357</td>
<td>-3.3850</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001

### Table 6
**Burnout and Rank**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9719</td>
<td>2.9719</td>
<td>4.5609</td>
<td>*0.0350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>71.0255</td>
<td>0.6516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.9975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.9650</td>
<td>9.9572</td>
<td>5.34E-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>-0.1565</td>
<td>-2.1356</td>
<td>0.03495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
The data indicate that there is a significant relationship between Burnout, rank, and age. However, based on the independent regression analyses, it is evident that age explains more of the relationship with Burnout than does rank.

Of 12 of the work and demographic characteristic variables, only two were found to be dependent with Burnout. (Two more were unable to be analyzed due to small cell sizes.) Overall, demographic characteristics within this sample do not appear to be significant in the manifestation of Burnout. However, the variables of academic rank and age do share some relationship with Burnout. Furthermore, relationships between Burnout, percentage of time spent advising, and sexual orientation should be matters of further investigation.
Discussion

**Burnout and Counselor Educators**

Despite the evidence that higher education faculty members experience Burnout (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Lackritz, 2004; Pretorius, 1994; Singh et al., 1998), this study indicates that counselor educators seem to be different from the norm. The level of Burnout the sample reported was surprisingly low, as evidenced by the low mean score and standard deviation on the BMS. Perhaps the unique characteristics of counselor educators influence their coping processes of occupational stress. That is, counselor educators' passion for the profession, desire to help others, and values of "giving back" (Magnuson et al., 2003) may somehow protect them from Burnout.

However, the data do suggest that occupational stress is a part of the profession. The tabulated percentages of the work conditions within the sample indicate that counselor educators experience similar stressors as other faculty members (i.e., tenure process, expectations for teaching, research, and service, etc.). Furthermore, the highest item scores on the BMS of "tired" and "disappointed with people" indicate that stress is an inherent part of the job. However, the lowest item scores of "worthless" and "helpless" suggest that counselor educators may have higher self-efficacy or better coping mechanisms with which to manage stress.

This latter theory seems to be supported by the findings in this study. The sample reported very high scores on the TEIQue-SF, suggesting that Trait Emotional
Intelligence is high overall within the population. The lowest score on the TEIQue-SF was well above the median of the instrument (TEIQue-SF $Mdn = 120$; lowest score $= 132$). Since Trait EI has been conceptualized as a personality characteristic that may influence coping strategies (Furnham et al., 2002; Petrides & Furnham, 2001), this theory would suggest that counselor educators have characteristics unique from faculty members in other disciplines, and, indeed, unique characteristics from workers in other professions.

The low Burnout scores and high Trait EI scores reported by the sample is an encouraging reflection for the counselor education field. However, the question arises of how Burnout prevention is woven throughout counselor education curriculum. If counselor educators are, for the most part, coping well with occupational stress, could they be neglecting Burnout prevention in their training of counselors? The paucity of counselor education literature on Burnout training and prevention validates this concern.

*The Trait Emotional Intelligence Construct*

This study has provided more insight into the Trait EI construct, namely that there is support for Trait EI conceptualized as a human characteristic that may influence coping strategies. The results of this study substantiate results from previous studies on Trait EI and coping (Furnham et al., 2002, 2003). However, the negative correlation between Burnout and the Trait EI construct was only moderate, suggesting that more research needs to occur before definitive conclusions can be drawn.
Currently, we cannot assume that high Trait EI is always a predictor of low Burnout; we can only assume that Trait EI has some sort of influence in a counselor educator's coping process.

Since the general EI construct is conceptualized in at least four distinct models with their own separate forms of measurement (Bar-On, 2005; Goleman, 1998; Mayer et al., 2004; Petrides & Furnham, 2001), it may be interesting to test the same sample using different EI measures simultaneously. This approach would lend more insight into the general EI construct, the occurrence of Emotional Intelligence in the sample, and the role of EI in the occupational stress coping process.

**Demographic Characteristics of Counselor Educators**

Counselor educators, while having similar demographic characteristics as faculty members in other disciplines, report less Burnout than other studies on higher education faculty members (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Lackritz, 2004; Pretorius, 1994; Singh et al., 1998). Out of 12 variables, only academic rank and age shared significant relationships with Burnout. The finding that Burnout is related to age was substantiated in some prior studies (Gold & Bachelor, 2001; Lackritz, 2004), but not in others (Coffey & Coleman, 2001; Hayter, 1999; Visintini & Campanini, 1996; Yiu-kee & Tang, 1995). However, none of the previous studies found a relationship between Burnout and academic rank. The average age of 49.55 indicates that counselor education comprises professors who are older than the mid-life developmental stage; perhaps counselor educators who have more longevity have
learned to manage the stress that is inherent in the profession better than younger counselor educators.

Another surprising finding is that Burnout does not seem to be related to research expectations in this sample. This finding is contrary to Singh, Mishra, and Kim’s (1998) study on the relationship of Burnout and intrinsic motivation to accomplish research. Interestingly, the present study indicated that younger, assistant professors experience more Burnout than older, full professors. Given that publication record is a vital part of the tenure and promotion process, it would seem logical that research expectations may have more of a role in Burnout. However, the data from this study did not indicate this.

Cultural variables of race and ethnic background did not share significant relationships with Burnout. This finding is similar to findings in other recent studies (Lackritz, 2004; Pines, 2004). However, future research should be purposeful in investigating the Burnout phenomenon in various races and ethnic identities. Despite the recognition of Burnout as a cross-cultural phenomenon (Perrewé et al., in press), it is still important to investigate cultural phenomena within a specific culture.

Finally, the variable of sexual orientation is of interest, given that the mean Burnout score for the six respondents was $2.7 (M > 2.4)$. As stated previously, the limited number of bisexual, gay, and lesbian sample participants makes it impossible to generalize this result to the larger population. However, the score of $> 2.4$ for these respondents indicates that it is important to consider sexual orientation as a prominent variable in future studies.
The Continuing Dialogue: Burnout, Internal Variables, and External Variables

One of the implicit goals of this study was to investigate the etiology of Burnout, specifically to address the continued debate about the role of external variables or internal variables (Bühler & Land, 2003; Maslach et al., 2001; Pines, 2004). The results of this study, while providing more insight into the Burnout phenomenon and the occupational characteristics of counselor educators, are still inconclusive to address this question. The mean Burnout score for the sample was low, making it difficult to actually investigate this phenomenon. Furthermore, the correlation between Burnout and the internal variable (Trait EI) was only moderate, and significant relationships between Burnout and external variables were found in only academic rank and age.

The results of this study are similar to the results of prior studies. After 30 years of research, there has been some progress, but there are still no definitive answers regarding the etiology of Burnout. Perhaps the dualistic philosophy of “internal factors versus external factors” is not serving the field well. Future research should consider the interchange of both external factors and internal factors within workers experiencing occupational stress, utilizing a person-environment fit paradigm to channel the investigation.

Another critical goal of Burnout research is to establish sound methods of prevention and intervention. The results from this study suggest that a holistic approach that incorporates both internal change and environmental change would be the most beneficial method of Burnout treatment. This approach is consistent with
Kessler's (1990) treatment strategy. Focusing on changing maladaptive coping strategies (or boosting healthy coping strategies), as well as advocating for systemic change would address the role of both internal factors and external factors as they relate to Burnout.

Limitations of the Study

A limitation to this study is the survey that was administered via the World Wide Web rather than in traditional paper-and-pencil format. To address the limitations inherent in a Web survey (Dillman, 2000), the survey was designed to accommodate specific limitations of graphic design and question format. However, during the data collection process, it was discovered that the survey did have some technological problems, namely, that some respondents were not able to register all of their answers pertaining to demographic variables. Through a trouble-shooting process, it was discovered that the survey did not register well with a certain Web browser. Approximately 10 respondents reported this problem and submitted surveys with incomplete data. Consequently, the data from these respondents could not be included in the analysis.

The second limitation is the design of the survey measures (TEIQue-SF and BMS). Both measures relied on self-report from the sample, rather than measuring observable behavior. Self-report, while describing the lived experiences from the respondents, is inherently subjective. Subjectivity is not likely an issue for the Burnout
measurement, but could be an issue for the measurement of EI given that prominent members of the EI field believe that the construct is ability-based (Caruso, 2004; Emmerling & Goleman, 2003).

The third limitation is the low response rate. The initial response rate was 46%, however, only 111 surveys were usable which resulted in a 38.4% response rate. Nonresponse error (less than 80% return rate) is an important issue to consider in context of external threats to validity (Linder, Murphy, & Briers, 2001). Nonresponse error was controlled for in this study via the data collection procedures set forth by Dillman (2002). However, despite five communications to the sample only a 46% response rate was extracted. Furthermore, due to the limitation of technological problems discussed above, the data from 21 more surveys was eliminated. Therefore, caution must be used in generalizing these study results to the population.

Finally, the homogeneity of the sample is a limitation. The majority of the participants reported identifying with the current U.S. dominant culture (i.e., white/Caucasian, Christian, and heterosexual). While most of the demographic variables had adequate data to perform statistical analyses, this study was unable to investigate thoroughly the relationship between cultural variables and Burnout. To the detriment of this study and the field as a whole, data on the relationship between Burnout and sexual orientation were inconclusive. Future research should purposefully strive to include individuals who identify with historically underrepresented populations, since the literature is lacking in this area.
Recommendations for Future Research

To date, the literature has been driven by attempts to understand the etiology of Burnout, which has resulted in large amounts of quantitative research. Therefore, researchers should consider engaging qualitative, phenomenological, and mixed method studies to explore the Burnout phenomenon more in depth. While some researchers have made a focus of qualitative and mixed methods (Pines, 2002; Sundin-Huard & Fahy, 1999), the preference sharply leans towards quantitative methods. It is imperative that the field begin to embrace qualitative work, since the emphasis on quantitative work for the past 30 years has not fully explained the Burnout construct.

Furthermore, the focus of the literature on Burnout does not necessarily lend insight into positive coping. We know which variables share relationships with Burnout, but do we know which variables share relationships with healthy coping strategies? The concept of occupational engagement (Maslach & Leiter, 1997), which investigates healthy coping strategies, may help shift this focus. By examining what makes an individual cope positively, researchers have more tools to alleviate Burnout. Research studies like Magnuson et al.'s (2003) qualitative study on leaders in the counseling field are a good example of phenomenological work focusing on positive factors.
Conclusion

Burnout, a problem that relates to an individual’s occupation or vocational life, is a prolonged manifestation of emotional exhaustion, cynicism related to work, physical ailments, and reduced accomplishment of work tasks. Recently, the literature has shown that faculty members in higher education experience Burnout as do other professions. However, there is limited research documenting the occupational experiences—including the manifestation of Burnout—in counselor educators.

Furthermore, a primary theme within the Burnout literature is the struggle to understand the etiology of the construct. Currently, there are two primary theories regarding the etiology of Burnout: (a) external or environmental factors are more responsible in the manifestation of Burnout, and (b) internal factors such as human personality traits or coping styles are more responsible in the manifestation of Burnout.

The purpose of this study was to determine if counselor educators experience Burnout and to examine the variables associated with it. Specifically, this study analyzed Burnout against both external and internal variables. A sample consisting of 289 counselor educators teaching in CACREP-accredited programs across the United States was administered a survey that measured Burnout, Trait Emotional Intelligence (Trait EI), and demographic variables. Overall, Burnout was very low in the sample ($M = 2.35; SD = .82$). There was a moderate, negative correlation between Burnout and Trait EI ($r = -0.4015$). Only two of the external variables yielded significant relationships to Burnout: academic rank ($\chi^2 = 12.66; p = .0018; p < .01$) and age ($\chi^2 = \ldots$)
Tenure status, length of time working as a counselor educator, percentage of work load teaching, percentage of workload researching, percentage of workload performing service, gender, religion, and race and ethnic background were all independent of Burnout. Future research should consider the interchange of both external factors and internal factors in workers experiencing occupational stress and Burnout.
Altun, İ. (2002). Burnout and nurses’ personal and professional values. *Nursing Ethics, 9*, 269-279.


APPENDICES
Appendix A: Survey
INFORMED CONSENT

Project Title: Counselor Educators: Work Perceptions, Personality and Environmental Variables
Principal Investigator: Dr. Dale-Elizabeth Pehrsson, School of Education, Counseling
Research Staff: Amy E. Bartley, Doctoral Candidate, Counseling

Thanks very much for helping with this survey. You are part of a carefully selected sample that has been asked to provide more information about counselor educators. We truly appreciate your assistance.

Please read the following page carefully. At the bottom of the page you will have the option to decide if you wish to participate in the study or not. Your responses are completely confidential, and will only be identified to the researchers by your e-mail address. Your e-mail address is used to limit the survey responses to the research sample, and to verify when participants have completed the survey. Should you have any difficulties in responding, please e-mail abartley@redhorsegroup.com or call (541) 680-4961.

PURPOSE
This is a research study. The purpose of this research study is to investigate the work perceptions, personality characteristics and environmental variables of counselor educators. We hope to learn more about the counselor education occupation and how to better strengthen it. The results are part of the dissertation research of Amy E. Bartley, and may later be published or presented in an academic forum. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether to be in the study or not. Please read this page carefully. You may ask any questions about the research, what you will be asked to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this page that is not clear. Questions should be addressed to Amy Bartley at (541) 680-4961 or via e-mail at abartley@redhorsegroup.com

When all of your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in this study or not. This process is called “informed consent”. If you agree to participate, a copy of this form will automatically be e-mailed to you for your records.

We are inviting you to participate in this research study because you are a counselor educator teaching in a program accredited by CACREP.

PROCEDURES
If you agree to participate, your involvement will last for approximately 12-15 minutes.

The following procedures are involved in this study. You will be asked to confirm your consent to participate. You will then be taken to the first page of the survey. The survey consists of three pages, on each of which you must submit your answers. When you have completed the third page of the study you will receive a confirmation message that indicates you have completed the survey.

RISKS

http://www.redhorsegroup.com/counseloreducatorsurvey/ 6/7/2005
There are no foreseeable risks for participating in this study.

**BENEFITS**
There are no foreseeable personal benefits that may occur as a result of your participation in the study. The researchers anticipate that the counselor education field may benefit from the study by obtaining information into the daily occupational experiences within this profession, thereby making recommendations to strengthen the field as a whole.

**COSTS AND COMPENSATION**
There are no costs for participating in this research study.

You may be compensated for participating in this research project. The researchers are offering two $50 gift certificates to Amazon.com. When you have completed the survey, your name will be entered into a random drawing in which two participants will win a $50 gift certificate. If you are a winner, the gift certificate will be sent to you via your e-mail address.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**
Records of participation in this research project will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. However, federal government regulatory agencies and the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies involving human subjects) may inspect and copy records pertaining to this research. It is possible that these records could contain information that personally identifies you. In the event of any report or publication from this study, your identity will not be disclosed. Results will be reported in a summarized manner in such a way that you cannot be identified.

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION**
Taking part in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you agree to participate in this study, you may stop participating at any time. When completing the survey, you may skip any question that you prefer not to answer. If you decide not to take part, or if you stop participating at any time, your decision will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled. Any data collected from you prior to withdrawal will not be included in the study.

**QUESTIONS**
Questions are encouraged. If you have any questions about this research project, please contact the Principal Investigator Dr. Dale-Elizabeth Pehrsson at dale.pehrsson@oregonstate.edu or by phone at (541) 737-8551 or the Student Researcher Amy Bartley at abartley@redhorsegroup.com or by phone at (541) 680-4961. If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Human Protections Administrator, at (541) 737-3437 or by e-mail at IRB@oregonstate.edu.

By entering your e-mail address below and clicking on "I Accept" below you have indicated that this research study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. You may print a copy of this form if you wish.

To begin, please enter your e-mail address: I Accept I Decline

http://www.redhorsegroup.com/counseloreducatorsurvey/ 6/7/2005
Thank you for completing this survey on the work perceptions, personality and environmental work variables of counselor educators!

INSTRUCTIONS
For questions 1-10, please use the following scale to answer the question:

1 never 2 almost never 3 rarely 4 sometimes 5 often 6 very often 7 always

When you are finished, please click on CONTINUE.

**Question:** When you think about your work overall, how often do you feel the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>almost never</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very often</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INSTRUCTIONS
For questions 11-40, please answer each statement below by clicking the number that best reflects your degree
of agreement or disagreement with that statement. Do not think too long about the exact meaning of the
statements. Work quickly and try to answer as accurately as possible. There are no right or wrong answers.

When you are finished, please click on CONTINUE

There are seven possible responses to each statement ranging from "Completely Disagree" (number 1) to
"Completely Agree" (number 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Expressing my emotions with words is not a problem for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I often find it difficult to see things from another person's viewpoint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. On the whole, I'm a highly motivated person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I usually find it difficult to regulate my emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I generally don't find life enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I can deal effectively with people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I tend to change my mind frequently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Many times, I can't figure out what emotion I'm feeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I often find it difficult to stand up for my rights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I'm usually able to influence the way other people feel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. On the whole, I have a gloomy perspective on most things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Those close to me often complain that I don't treat them right.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I often find it difficult to adjust my life according to the circumstances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. On the whole, I'm able to deal with stress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. I often find it difficult to show my affection to those close to me.

27. I'm normally able to “get into someone’s shoes” and experience their emotions.

28. I normally find it difficult to keep myself motivated.

29. I'm usually able to find ways to control my emotions when I want to.

30. On the whole, I'm pleased with my life.

31. I would describe myself as a good negotiator.

32. I tend to get involved in things that I later wish I could get out of.

33. I often pause and think about my feelings.

34. I believe I'm full of personal strengths.

35. I tend to “back down” even if I know I'm right.

36. I don't seem to have any power at all over other people's feelings.

37. I generally believe that things will work out fine in my life.

38. I find it difficult to bond well even with those close to me.

39. Generally, I'm able to adapt to new environments.

40. Others admire me for being relaxed.

[Table with options to select from 1 to 7 for each statement]
INSTRUCTIONS
Questions 41-53 inquire about work and demographic characteristics. Please read each question carefully. Certain questions will have specific instructions.

When you have finished, please click on SUBMIT ANSWERS at the bottom of the page. You will have completed the survey when you have submitted your answers.

INSTRUCTIONS
For questions 41-44, please select the answer that is most representative of you right now. You may only designate one response per question.

41. Please indicate your academic rank:
   - Adjunct professor/part time instructor
   - Full time instructor
   - Assistant professor
   - Associate professor
   - Full professor
   - Professor Emeritus

42. Please indicate your tenure status:
   - Non-tenured
   - Working towards tenure
   - Tenured

43. Please indicate the length of time you have worked as a counselor educator:
   - 1-2 years
   - 3-5 years
   - 6-12 years
   - 13 years or longer

44. Please indicate the type of institution at which you work:
   - Public
   - Private

INSTRUCTIONS
For questions 45-48, you will be asked to describe your work load by estimating the total percentage of time you perform the following work tasks of teaching, advising students, researching and performing service work. You may only designate one response per question. It may be most helpful to read through questions 45-48 before answering.

45. Percentage of workload teaching:
   - 25% or less
   - 50% or less
   - 75% or less
   - 100%

46. Percentage of workload advising students:
   - 25% or less
   - 50% or less
   - 75% or less
Counselor Educator Survey

47. Percentage of workload researching:
   - 25% or less
   - 50% or less
   - 75% or less
   - 100%

48. Percentage of workload performing service work:
   - 25% or less
   - 50% or less
   - 75% or less
   - 100%

INSTRUCTIONS
For questions 49-52 you will be asked to identify demographic characteristics. You may only choose one per question.

49. Please indicate how you identify your gender:
   - Female
   - Male
   - Transgendered

50. Please indicate how you identify your sexual orientation:
   - Bisexual
   - Gay
   - Heterosexual/Straight
   - Lesbian
   - Pansexual
   - Asexual

51. Please indicate your age range:
   - 20-30
   - 31-40
   - 41-50
   - 51-60
   - 61-70
   - 70 or above
52. Please indicate how you identify your religion/spirituality:

- Agnostic
- Atheist
- Buddhist
- Christian
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- Pagan
- Naturalist
- Other spiritual/religious affiliation

INSTRUCTIONS
For question 53, please indicate how you identify your race and ethnic background. You may choose as many as apply. If you identify as International, please also type your country of origin in the box below.

- African
- African American
- Asian American
- Middle Eastern
- Black
- European American
- East Indian
- Latino/a/Hispanic
- Native (American Indian) or Indigenous
- Pacific Islander/Alaskan
- White
- Other Race or Ethnic Background
- Biracial
- Multiracial
- International

Specify country of origin __________________________

SUBMIT ANSWERS
You have now completed the survey, and have been entered into the drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Amazon.com. We expect the drawing to occur on March 30, 2005. If you are a winner, you will be notified via e-mail.

Thank you very much for your help with this important study.
Appendix B: Sample Correspondence
Subject: Counselor Educator Survey

Dear Dr. [last name to be inserted],

Greetings! A few days from now you will receive an e-mail inviting you to participate in an important research study on the work perceptions, personality characteristics and the environmental work variables of counselor educators.

I am writing in advance because I understand that many survey participants like to know ahead of time that they will be invited to participate. This study is the first of its kind, and will help provide insight into the occupational experiences of counselor educators.

The survey data for this research study will be collected via a Web survey. Future e-mails will give you specific directions on how to access and complete the survey.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It's only with the generous help of people like you that this research can be successful.

Sincerely,

Amy E. Bartley, PhD Candidate, NCC, GCDF
Oregon State University
Phone: (541) 680-4961
E-mail: abartley@redhorsegroup.com

P. S. There will be an incentive for participating in this survey, as a way of saying thanks.

*The Red Horse Group is an independent web consulting organization. For more information, please view their website at www.redhorsegroup.com
Subject: Counselor Educator Survey

Dear Dr. [lastname to be inserted],

I am writing to ask your help in a study of the work perceptions, personality characteristics and the environmental work variables of counselor educators. You were selected to participate in this study since you are teaching in a counselor education program that is accredited by CACREP.

This study is part of my dissertation research. The results will increase our knowledge about the occupational experiences of faculty teaching in counselor education programs. This information will help to strengthen the counselor education profession.

The survey is completed via a Web format, and will take approximately 12-15 minutes. The only technological skill needed to complete the survey is familiarity with navigating the Internet. Directions for completing the survey will appear as you proceed.

To access the survey, please click here. You will be taken to a page requiring you log in by entering your e-mail address. (Your e-mail address is used only to track who has completed the survey and who hasn’t. You will never be asked to identify your name at any point in the survey.) You will then be taken to an informed consent page for the research study. After carefully reviewing this form, you may decide if you wish to participate in the study, or if you would like to decline.

As a way of saying thanks, participants who complete the survey will automatically be entered into a drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Amazon.com. After the close of data collection, two names will be chosen, and the $50 gift certificates will be sent to the winners’ e-mail addresses.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, I would be happy to talk with you. My e-mail address is abartley@redhorsegroup.com, and my phone number is (541) 680-4961. You may also contact the chair of my doctoral committee, Dr. Dale-Elizabeth Pehrsson, by e-mailing dale.pehrsson@oregonstate.edu or calling (541) 737-8551.

Once again, click here to access the survey. (MAC users may find it easier to access the survey by cutting and pasting this link: http://redhorsegroup.com/counseloreducatorsurvey).

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Amy E. Bartley, PhD Candidate, NCC, GCDF
Oregon State University
Phone: (541) 680-4961
E-mail: abartley@redhorsegroup.com

*The Red Horse Group is an independent web consulting organization. For more information, please view their website at www.redhorsegroup.com*
Subject: Counselor Educator Survey

Dear Dr. [last name to be inserted],

Last week I e-mailed requesting your participation on a survey of work perceptions, personality characteristics and the environmental work variables of counselor educators. Your name was randomly selected from a database of counselor education programs accredited by CACREP.

I know that you are extremely busy, but would you kindly take a few minutes to complete this survey? Doing so will help provide more understanding about the occupational experiences of faculty teaching in counselor education programs.

The survey is completed via a Web format, and will take approximately 12-15 minutes. The only technological skill needed to complete the survey is familiarity with navigating the Internet. Directions for completing the survey will appear as you proceed.

To access the survey, please click here. You will be taken to a page requiring you log in by entering your e-mail address. (Your e-mail address is used only to track who has completed the survey and who hasn't. You will never be asked to identify your name at any point in the survey.) You will then be taken to an informed consent page for the research study. After carefully reviewing this form, you may decide if you wish to participate in the study, or if you would like to decline.

Once again, click here to access the survey. (MAC users may find it easier to access the survey by cutting and pasting this link: http://redhorsegroup.com/counseloreducatorsurvey).

Thank you for your time and participation in this very important research.

Sincerely,

Amy E. Bartley, PhD Candidate, NCC, GCDF
Oregon State University
Phone: (541) 680-4961
E-mail: abartley@redhorsegroup.com

*The Red Horse Group is an independent web consulting organization. For more information, please view their website at www.redhorsegroup.com
Subject: Counselor Educator Survey

Dear Dr. [last name to be inserted],

About three weeks ago I sent an e-mail inviting you to participate in a survey of work perceptions, personality characteristics and the environmental work variables of counselor educators. To this date, I have not received your results.

The comments of people who have already responded include a wide variety of experiences as a counselor educator. I think the results are going to be very important in helping understand the occupational practice of counselor education, thus strengthening the profession even more.

I am writing again because of the importance that your responses have for helping get accurate results. Although many counselor educators across the U. S. were contacted, it’s only by hearing from nearly everyone that we can be sure the results are truly representative.

The survey is completed via a Web format, and will take approximately 12-15 minutes. The only technological skill needed to complete the survey is familiarity with navigating the Internet. Directions for completing the survey will appear as you proceed.

To access the survey, please click here. (MAC users may find it easier to access the survey by cutting and pasting this link: http://redhorsegroup.com/counseloreducatorsurvey). You will be taken to an Informed Consent page, after which you will be asked to enter in your e-mail address to begin the survey. (Your e-mail address is used only to track who has completed the survey and who hasn’t. You will never be asked to identify your name at any point in the survey.) After carefully reviewing this form, you may decide if you wish to participate in the study, or if you would like to decline.

I hope that you will complete the survey soon, but if for any reason you prefer not to participate, please let me know by sending me a quick reply indicating your decline.

Once again, please click here to access the survey.

Thank you, once again, for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Amy E. Bartley, PhD Candidate, NCC, GCDF
Oregon State University
Phone: (541) 680-4961
E-mail: abartley@redhorsegroup.com

P. S. Let me remind you once again, there is an incentive for completing the survey. As a way of saying thanks, participants who complete the survey will automatically be entered into a drawing for a $50 gift certificate to Amazon.com. After the close of data collection, two names will be chosen, and the $50 gift certificates will be sent to the winners’ e-mail addresses.

*The Red Horse Group is an independent web consulting organization. For more information, please view their website at www.redhorsegroup.com
Subject: Counselor Educator Survey

Dear Dr. [last name to be inserted],

During the last four weeks I have sent you several e-mails about an important research study on the work perceptions, personality characteristics and the environmental work variables of counselor educators.

The purpose of this study is to provide more insight into the occupational practice of counselor education, thus strengthening the profession even more.

The study is drawing to a close, and this is the last contact that will be made with the people who can provide the best information about this very important subject.

I am sending this final e-mail invitation with “high importance” to communicate the importance of including your responses. Hearing from everyone in this sample helps assure that the survey results are as accurate as possible.

I also want to assure you that your response is voluntary, and that you do not have to respond if you choose not to do so. However, if you choose not to participate, will you send me a quick reply indicating your decline?

The survey is completed via a Web format, and will take approximately 12-15 minutes. The only technological skill needed to complete the survey is familiarity with navigating the Internet. Directions for completing the survey will appear as you proceed.

To access the survey, please click here. You will be taken to a page requiring you log in by entering your e-mail address. (Your e-mail address is used only to track who has completed the survey and who hasn’t. You will never be asked to identify your name at any point in the survey.) You will then be taken to an informed consent page for the research study. After carefully reviewing this form, you may decide if you wish to participate in the study, or if you would like to decline.

Finally, I appreciate your willingness to consider this request as we conclude this effort to better understand the occupational experiences of counselor educators. Thank you very much.

Once again, please click here to access the survey. (MAC users may find it easier to access the survey by cutting and pasting this link: http://redhorsegroup.com/counseloreducatorsurvey).

Sincerely,

Amy E. Bartley, PhD Candidate, NCC, GCDF
Oregon State University
Phone: (541) 680-4961
E-mail: abartley@redhorsegroup.com

*The Red Horse Group is an independent web consulting organization. For more information, please view their website at www.redhorsegroup.com*